CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER, YOUTH CORRECTIONAL OFFICER & YOUTH CORRECTIONAL COUNSELOR JOB ANALYSIS REPORT

DECEMBER 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

I. OVERVIEW OF THE CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

The Board of Corrections (BOC) was established in 1944 as part of the reorganization of the State prison system. Commencing July 1, 2005, the BOC was abolished and the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) was established within the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). The CSA works in partnership with city and county officials to develop and maintain standards for the construction of local jails and juvenile detention facilities, the operation of state and local jails and juvenile detention facilities, and for the selection and training of state and local corrections personnel. The CSA also inspects local adult and juvenile detention facilities; administers grant programs that respond to facility construction needs, juvenile crime and delinquency; and conducts special studies relative to the public safety of California's communities.

In carrying out these major responsibilities, the CSA and its staff work closely with county sheriffs, directors of corrections, and chief probation officers, as well as other state and local officials and community-based service providers, to achieve continued improvement in the conditions of local detention facilities and the delivery of effective state and local corrections programs. Statutes relating to the authority, programs, and mandates of the CSA are contained in the California Penal, and Welfare, and Institutions Codes. Operating regulations are found in Title 15 of the California Code of Regulations and physical plant regulations are contained in Title 24.

The responsibility for developing and monitoring selection and training standards for designated state correctional peace officer classifications was chaptered in the Penal Code in 1998 in response to several highly publicized incidents which highlighted the need for selection and training standards as a means to improve employee job performance, ensure safe departmental operations, and increase public safety. This responsibility encompasses 47 state correctional peace officer classifications which employ approximately 48,000 correctional peace officers. The enabling legislation originally assigned standard setting responsibility to the Commission on Correctional Peace Officer Standards and Training (CPOST). On July 1, 2005, CPOST was abolished and the responsibility for developing, approving, and monitoring selection and training standards for entry-level, advanced rank-and-file, and first and second line supervisory State correctional peace officer personnel was transferred to the CSA.

II. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide the results of the CSA's job analysis of the Correctional Officer (CO), Youth Correctional Officer (YCO), and Youth Correctional Counselor (YCC) classifications. The CSA analyzed the three job classifications in order to provide a baseline for setting the selection and training standards for these positions. The job analysis is consistent with the requirements of the *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* (Federal Register, 1978), the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association & National Council on Measurement in Education, 1999), and the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., 2003).

Job analysis is the industry and court-approved method upon which to build selection and training standards. To select and train qualified personnel to perform a job, one needs to determine what job incumbents must know and be able to do in order to achieve acceptable performance. The basis of all selection and training standards is a thorough study of the content and requirements of the job.

B. Classification Concept

According to the State Personnel Board (SPB), there were approximately 22,993 COs, 816 YCOs, and 580 YCCs employed within CDCR as of October 2006 (Appendix A). CDCR is the sole user of these entry level classifications.

The CO is the largest correctional peace officer classification in California's state corrections system. The primary responsibility of a CO is public protection, although duties vary by institution and post. Assignments may include working in reception centers, housing units, kitchens, towers, or control booths; at gun posts; or on yards, outside crews or transportation units. COs currently attend a 16-week training academy and complete a formal 2-year apprenticeship program.

The majority of COs are employed in CDCR's Division of Adult Institutions (DAI), which is part of Adult Operations, and is comprised of five mission-based disciplines including Reception Centers, High Security/Transitional Housing, General Population Levels Two and Three, General Population Levels Three and Four, and Female Offenders. Thirty-three state institutions ranging from minimum to maximum security, 40 camps, 12 community correctional facilities (CCFs), and five prisoner mother facilities are included. CDCR's adult institutions house a total of approximately 172,284 inmates.

The direct promotional classification for the CO is the Correctional Sergeant. This promotional pattern requires two years of experience as a CO. The Correctional Sergeant is distinguished in level from the CO based upon duties, degree of supervision provided in the completion of work assignments, and levels of responsibility and accountability.

The YCO classification is the largest correctional peace officer classification in CDCR's Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), followed by the YCC classification. The YCO is responsible for security of the facility and custody and supervision of juvenile offenders. The YCC is responsible for counseling, supervising, and maintaining custody of juvenile offenders, as well as performing the casework responsibilities for treatment and parole planning within DJJ facilities. YCOs and YCCs currently attend a 16-week training academy and complete a formal 2-year apprenticeship program.

YCOs and YCCs are employed in the DJJ which operates 8 facilities, 2 camps, and 14 parole offices. Approximately 2,509 youth are housed in DJJ facilities, 138 are in DJJ camps, and there are 3,017 juvenile parolees. There is a total of 1,970 custody staff working in DJJ facilities statewide.

The direct promotional classification for the YCO is the Youth Correctional Sergeant. This promotional pattern requires two years of experience as a YCO. For the YCC, the direct promotional classification is the Senior Youth Correctional Counselor. This promotional pattern requires two years of experience as a YCC. Both promotional patterns are distinguished in level from the entry-level classifications based upon duties, degree of supervision provided in the completion of work assignments, and levels of responsibility and accountability.

C. Approach

One of the CSA's goals is to improve and maintain competence among corrections personnel in the state of California. The best way to achieve this mission is to select the right people into corrections jobs and give them the proper training to help them succeed. Selecting the right people and

providing the right training relies on thorough job analysis information so that the criteria for defining what is right can be firmly established. Only then can the CSA understand fully what corrections personnel must know and do in order to successfully perform their jobs.

Most often, job analysis is performed on one job classification at a time (for example, correctional officer). However, the CSA is responsible for setting the employee selection and training standards for a sizeable group of related State correctional job classifications (currently 47). Conducting 47 separate in-depth studies would be prohibitively expensive and time-consuming. Fortunately for this project, State corrections job classifications overlap in terms of content. This overlap allows for the possibility of using a "job components" or "job families" approach to employee selection and training. Through this approach, the common building blocks of all correctional job classifications can be discovered and organized. These job components that cut across multiple job classifications then serve as the unit of analysis for developing selection and training tools and practices. With this approach, time and effort is not wasted in "rediscovering the wheel" for jobs that are similar to jobs already analyzed. If several jobs share comparable components, the CSA can capitalize on this overlap and standardize many selection and training materials and procedures across jobs, and therefore, work much more efficiently.

Among the various correctional peace officer classifications within CDCR, there are substantial differences in the responsibilities of and duties performed by incumbents; however, there is a measure of overlap, even among classifications of a disparate nature. Regardless of whether an incumbent is employed in an adult institution or a juvenile facility, duties in areas relating to emergency response and report writing, for example, are similar in terms of the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for successful performance of the associated tasks. This hypothesis, that overlap exists in the duties performed by California's correctional peace officer classifications, provides the vehicle for grouping the CO, YCO, and YCC classifications and analyzing them together based on their job functions and duties. Various sources of information, including work process documentation, job classification specifications, and academy and supervisory training courses, were reviewed to provide support for this method of analysis.

For the purposes of this report, past research and job analysis literature was reviewed to form the basis of the CSA job analysis approach. This includes coverage of traditional job analysis literature as well as prior approaches toward a broad-based occupational analysis or job family analysis system. See Appendix B for a review of the literature regarding the use of the job families approach in personnel research.

III. METHOD

A. Job Analysis Phases

The job analysis was conducted in several phases, many of which involved the extensive use of subject matter experts (SMEs) from CDCR institutions and facilities (Table 1). The SMEs consisted of job incumbents representing each of the three classifications and direct line supervisory classifications. Job incumbents were selected because they perform the job and are in the best position to rate how frequently a task is performed. Supervisors were selected because they have a broader view of the CDCR's vision, mission, and values and are in the best position to rate how important a task is. By including both incumbent and supervisory perspectives, the CSA was able to compile the most accurate representation of the CO, YCO, and YCC jobs.

Table 1. Job Analysis Phases	
Phase	**Activity**
1.	Literature review & task list/KSAO list consolidation
2.	Consolidation validation - editing of task/KSAO lists
3.	Development and administration of job analysis questionnaire (JAQ)
4.	Analysis of JAQ results
5.	Task to KSAO linkages & KSAO ratings
6.	Analysis of linkage results

Eight DJJ facilities and 30 of the adult institutions participated in the job analysis (Appendix C). Throughout the project, the CSA sought to minimize the operational impact on the youth and adult facilities. When possible, local SMEs were used to reduce the cost of travel. In addition, during Phase 3, the CSA traveled to some institutions on more than one occasion to reduce the impact caused by SME participation. Finally, the CSA reimbursed the facilities for all travel and back up costs associated with the job incumbents' and supervisors' participation in the job analysis activities.

In order to facilitate the participation of SMEs from the selected facilities and institutions, CDCR assigned the CSA a liaison from each of the five CDCR missions as well as from DJJ. These liaisons and their associates at the institutions and facilities were instrumental in selecting the appropriate SMEs based on the required gender and ethnic representations, scheduling the CSA's visits, and making arrangements for on-site administration of the survey.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW AND TASK/KNOWLEDGE, SKILL, ABILITY, AND OTHER CHARACTERISTIC (KSAO) CONSOLIDATION

The CSA obtained job specifications for the CO, YCO, and YCC classifications from the SPB website; collected previous job analyses from CPOST, the California Department of Corrections (CDC), and the BOC; and reviewed pertinent classifications within the Occupational Information Network (O*NET). The CSA reviewed a total of 25 previous job analyses, each containing a list of task statements representing the duties performed in the CO, YCO, and YCC classifications (Appendix D).

All statements were assembled, resulting in a final list of 1,981 task statements. The task statements were compiled into a single list of tasks to provide the means to test the hypothesis of overlap between the CO, YCO, and YCO jobs.

Several of the job analyses used to compile the task list were conducted on the same or similar classifications at different times and by different organizations; therefore, the list contained numerous duplications and statements with the same or similar meanings. The CSA removed these duplications using an iterative process to consolidate the statements into an unduplicated list of broad task statements. The consolidation process involved the following steps:

- Sorted the list alphabetically and eliminated exact duplicates of task statements.
- Combined similar statements with the same meaning.
- Split task statements that contained more than one action verb (unless the actions were intrinsically linked).
- Selected the best wording for each statement based on industry approved guidelines for writing task statements.
- Rewrote statements to a broader task statement level.

Traditional job analysis theory recommends a detailed construction of task statements to define what action is being performed, why the action is being performed, and what tools are used to perform the action. The CSA chose a broader task statement construction method that is limited to the action performed because it is a better fit with the chosen job analysis approach (a concurrent examination of the CO, YCO, and YCC classifications). Broader task statements are more easily recognizable between classifications. In addition, broader task statements allow for the incorporation of the mandates of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

The task consolidation effort produced a list of 305 CO, YCO, and YCC broad task statements which were then grouped by SMEs into 20 categories of tasks based on duty area. In addition, a list of 83 equipment items used in the performance of the CO, YCO, and YCC positions was developed using information from all available job analyses for these classifications.

The CSA conducted a similar process in the consolidation of KSAO statements. Approximately 7,000 KSAO statements were gathered from a total of 78 previous job analyses of various CDCR state correctional peace officer positions and combined into a database for the purposes of consolidation (Appendix D). Many of the statements were not written in a traditional KSAO statement format, and consisted of single words, sentence fragments, or entire paragraphs. Other statements were more appropriate to a list of tasks or equipment items than KSAOs and were moved to the task statement list. The CSA again conducted an iterative process using the following steps:

- Sorted the list alphabetically and eliminated exact duplicates of task statements.
- Determined whether each statement was truly a knowledge, skill, ability, or other personal characteristic using industry approved definitions.
- Categorized KSAO statements based on the O*NET classification system (SIOP, 2003).
- Combined similar statements, resulting in more general KSAO statement levels.
- Split complex statements representing more than one KSAO.
- Rewrote statements to improve quality.
- Eliminated examples from each statement.

This resulted in an unduplicated list of 122 corrections-related KSAO statements. Each KSAO statement was then linked to a category of knowledge, skills, abilities, or work styles in the O*NET classification system.

V. CONSOLIDATION VALIDATION

In order to determine whether the CSA's consolidation of the task statements resulted in an accurate representation of the CO, YCO, and YCC positions, the CSA conducted a validation process using SMEs. The validation process allowed the SMEs to confirm or disagree that the historical tasks compiled from previous job analyses continue to be a part of the CO, YCO, and YCC duties. In addition, recognizing the dynamic nature of correctional duties, it provided the SMEs with an opportunity to identify new tasks that have emerged due to policy changes since the last job analyses were conducted.

A total of three consolidation validation workshops were held in March and April 2007. The CSA's staff selected SMEs for each workshop based on the gender and ethnic representation of CO, YCO, and YCC job incumbents and supervisors across the State (Appendix E). Incumbents and supervisors participated in separate workshops in order to mitigate supervisory influence over incumbents. See Appendix C for the facilities represented in the consolidation validation workshops.

For the first workshop, nine job incumbents met over a two-day period to serve as SMEs. Five were COs, two were YCOs, and the remaining two were YCCs. Incumbent years of employment ranged from 2 to 21 years within CDCR. The results of this workshop were used as the basis for subsequent consolidation validation workshops thereby reducing the review time and number of required SMEs.

SMEs were provided with a presentation outlining the structure and background of the CSA, the focus of the job analysis, the purpose of the workshop, and specific instructions for the day's activities. SMEs were assigned to one of three groups. Each group consisted of three to four SMEs (a balance of CO, YCO, and YCC incumbents), a CSA staff facilitator, and a graduate student assistant that served as a recorder.

SMEs were instructed to silently review task statements by category and document any comments or suggestions directly on the form provided. SMEs were asked to keep the following questions in mind during the silent review process:

- Can you come up with specific examples of the performance of this task?
- What, if anything, is missing from the Broad Task Statement?
- Are there any grammar/spelling mistakes?
- Are there any formatting issues?
- Is the wording clear?

SMEs were also asked to note any areas where it was difficult to come up with examples. In reference to each task statement, broad task statement, and task category, SMEs were asked to answer three questions:

1. Is the original task assigned to the most appropriate broad task statement?
2. Does the broad task, as written, accurately and completely represent the assigned group of tasks?
3. Is the broad task statement assigned to the most appropriate category?

If the answer was "no" to any of those questions, SMEs were asked to make suggestions for rewriting the broad task statement, merging it into another broad task statement and/or category, or deleting it.

SMEs were then asked to discuss any suggested changes with the rest of the members of their group and come to a consensus (whenever possible) regarding any change. Graduate students recorded all comments and the facilitator reiterated instructions regularly to keep the SMEs focused. As SME groups completed their review of each category, suggestions were noted on a draft document, which was reviewed by all participants at the conclusion of the two-day workshop. At that time, further attempts were made to reach consensus on all changes.

The second consolidation validation workshop was held in April 2007 and consisted of seven CO, YCO, and YCC job incumbents. The purpose of this second workshop was to focus on a detailed review of the broad task statements. The process of orientation and instructions for the SMEs mirrored that of the first workshop, with the exception that SMEs were not asked to conduct an initial review of the broad task statements for mechanical and grammatical errors, since this was completed at the first consolidation validation meeting. SMEs were asked if each broad task statement was a proper representation of the group of task statements listed under it. They were also

asked to make suggestions for anything missing from the statement that, when added, would make the statement more representative of the group of tasks.

The third consolidation validation workshop was conducted in April 2007 and consisted of seven supervisors. The purpose of this meeting was to provide a final review of the broad task statements from the supervisory perspective as well as a review of the changes recommended by the previous SMEs. Supervisors were provided the same orientation and instructions that SMEs were given at the start of the first two workshops. The final document containing the changes made by SMEs during the first two workshops was presented to the supervisors to either approve the changes or give comments and final suggestions for changes. Changes suggested by the SMEs included non-substantive changes such as moving broad task statements into a different category and spelling/grammar adjustments. More significant changes included eliminating broad task statements, merging two or more together, or rewriting the statements.

The three workshops resulted in the elimination of the Supervisory Tasks category from the original list of 20 task categories and a decrease in the broad task statement list from 330 to 291 (Appendix F). See Table 2 for the final list of task categories.

Table 2. Final Task Categories

1. Arrests
2. Booking, Receiving/Releasing
3. Casework
4. Counseling
5. Court-related Board Hearings
6. Emergencies
7. Escorting/Movement/Transportation
8. General Duties
9. Health/Medical
10. Investigation
11. Oral Communication
12. Reading/Reviewing/Analyzing
13. Referrals
14. Restraints/Use of Force
15. Searching
16. Security
17. Supervising Wards/Inmates
18. Supervising Non-Inmate Movement
19. Written Communication

VI. JOB ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION

The Job Analysis Questionnaire (JAQ) was developed using the final task statement list resulting from the consolidation validation workshops. The questionnaire included three sections: background information questions, task statements, and equipment items (Appendix G). The background section consisted of questions regarding demographic information (e.g., age, ethnicity, gender, education level, etc.) and work information (e.g., current assignment and classification, length of employment, responsibility area, etc.). The task statement section included 291 tasks, which were grouped into 19 categories. The equipment section included a list of 83 equipment items.

A. Task and Equipment Rating Scales

The JAQ used two rating scales for SMEs to evaluate each task statement and equipment item. The primary goal of the rating process was to obtain basic job definitions of the three classifications and to determine whether these basic, core definitions were in fact sufficiently similar for the three classifications to treat them as a job family.

The first scale, shown in the boxes below, was a frequency-type scale designed to obtain an assessment of the likelihood that a new entry-level job incumbent would encounter the task or equipment item when assigned to a facility.

Scale A: Frequency

Based on your experience in the facilities in which you've worked, how many entry-level correctional peace officers will perform this task in the first three years on the job (even if they do it only a few times)?
> *(0) Task Not Part of Job*
> *(1) Less than a Majority*
> *(2) A Majority*

Based on your experience in the facilities in which you've worked, how many entry level correctional peace officers will use this item in the first three years on the job (even if they only use it a few times)?
> *(0) Item Not Used on the Job*
> *(1) Less than a Majority*
> *(2) A Majority*

While job analysis often involves more complex and detailed frequency scales to determine whether a task is performed or equipment item is used daily, weekly, monthly, and so on, the goal was to answer a simpler and more direct question: When a new correctional peace officer is assigned to a facility (*any* facility) are they likely to encounter this task or equipment item? This frequency aspect of the rating is framed in terms of *how many incumbents* will perform the task or use the equipment item rather than *how often* they will perform it or use it. If a majority of incumbents in all three classifications are likely to encounter the task or equipment item, this demonstrates the task or equipment item is core to all three classifications. Due to the length of the survey and relative simplicity of the question under investigation, a simple and straightforward three-point scale was adopted in an attempt to lessen rater fatigue and aid in an efficient and reliable rating process.

The second rating scale is an importance-type scale, and operationalizes task and equipment importance in terms of the consequences of not performing the task or using the equipment item correctly. This operationalization of importance was adopted primarily because corrections work takes place in an environment where certain tasks (e.g., restraining inmates) or equipment items (e.g., handcuffs) can have serious consequences if performed incorrectly or not at all. A more general importance or criticality rating scale may be subject to different interpretations from different raters, and here it was crucial to ensure that all raters were focusing on this same aspect of importance for determining core tasks that define the jobs. The rating scale is shown in the boxes below:

Scale B: Consequence of Error

How likely is it that there would be serious negative consequences if the task is NOT performed or if it is performed incorrectly?
    (0) Task Not Part of Job
    (1) Not likely
    (2) Likely

How likely is it that there would be serious negative consequences if this item was used incorrectly?
    (0) Item Not Used on the Job
    (1) Not Likely
    (2) Likely

Again, a relatively simple three-point scale was adopted in an attempt to reduce rater fatigue and obtain an assessment of whether there is likely to be serious consequences associated with not performing the task, using the equipment item, or performing the task or using the equipment item incorrectly. Additional rating dimensions and rating scales were considered, but after much consideration and rewriting of the scales, the CSA deemed the two current scales as central to obtaining what was needed from the rating process.

B. Rater and Facility Sampling Plan

The JAQ rater and facility sampling plan targeted participation of 600 SMEs at 19 youth and adult facilities. The demographic sampling plan was representative of the gender and ethnic composition of the targeted classifications (Appendix H). Large sample sizes are associated with lower standard errors of the mean ratings and narrower confidence intervals (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). Larger sample sizes therefore result in increasingly more stable and precise estimates of population parameters (Meyers et al., 2006). Given the intention to generalize from a sample of SMEs to their respective population, a sufficient sample size was needed.

At the time the survey was administered, California's youth and adult facilities were suffering from high vacancy rates in the CO, YCO, and YCC classifications which prohibited the use of a larger sample size. The target sample size of 600 was sufficient to provide stability to the data while mitigating the operational impact to the participating facilities.

The rater sampling plan represented an average of 2.2 percent of incumbents and supervisors in the target classifications, as of October 31, 2006 (Table 3). The sampling plan included representation from the three classifications being analyzed (CO, YCO, YCC) as well as from the three classifications that directly supervise those classifications (Correctional Sergeant, Youth Correctional Sergeant, and Senior Youth Correctional Counselor).

Approximately 60 percent of the 600 desired raters were identified to rate the CO classification while 40 percent of the raters were identified to rate the YCO and YCC classifications. The rater sampling plan included a larger number of raters for the CO classification because it employs the largest majority of correctional peace officers.

In order to achieve equal representation across facilities, the total number of desired raters for each classification was evenly divided by the number of participating facilities. Therefore, the rater sampling plan included approximately 19 COs and 9 Correctional Sergeants from each adult facility, and 19 YCOs, 3 Youth Correctional Sergeants, 19 YCCs, and 3 Senior Youth Correctional Counselors from each juvenile facility.

Table 3. Rater Sampling Plan

Classification Rating	Current Classification*	Total Population	Target Sample Size	Percent of Classification Represented
Correctional Officer	Correctional Officer	22,993	242	1.1
	Correctional Sergeant	2,682	104	3.9
	Total	25,675	346	-
Youth Correctional Officer	Youth Correctional Officer	816	111	13.6
	Youth Correctional Sergeant	80	15	18.8
	Total	896	126	-
Youth Correctional Counselor	Youth Correctional Counselor	580	112	19.3
	Senior Youth Correctional Counselor	77	16	20.1
	Total	657	128	-
Total		27,228	600	2.2

*Note. * Includes both full and part-time employment as reported by SPB Report 3105 (Appendix A)*

California's youth and adult facilities differ greatly around such elements as size and inmate capacity, geographic location, age, design, inmate programs, and inmate populations. Therefore, the CSA researched these varying elements across all youth and adult facilities and designed a facility sampling plan that was representative of each (Appendix I).

The facility sampling plan was representative of the:

- **Inmate population**. Adult institutions that house Level I, II, III, and IV inmates were all represented as were Juvenile facilities that house all youthful offenders including younger offenders and adult offenders. Facilities that house male offenders and as well as those that house female offenders were included in the sampling plan.

- **Programs within adult and juvenile facilities**. This included facilities with Reception Centers, Administrative Segregation Units, Secure and Protective Housing Units, Condemned Units, Conservation Camps, Transitional Housing Units, Medical Units and Hospitals, Psychiatric Services Units, Outpatient Housing Units, Enhanced Outpatient Units, Substance Abuse Treatment Facilities, Substance Abuse Programs, and Correctional Treatment Centers. In addition, it included youth facilities with Reception Centers, Conservation Camps, and Specialized Treatment Programs.

- **Design features including an equal mix of adult and juvenile facilities with new and old construction**. Design features such as dormitory units, podular designs, tiers, individual cells, 270/180 degree of viewing angle, and inmate capacity were all represented.

- **Geographic locations of youth and adult facilities including facilities in Northern, Central, and Southern California**.

Between May and August 2007, the CSA staff traveled to 13 adult institutions and 6 juvenile facilities and administered the JAQ to approximately 550 job incumbents and supervisors to collect data about the frequency and importance of tasks performed on the job by the CO, YCO and YCC classifications. This represented a survey return rate of 91 percent of the targeted sample size of 600 (Table 4).

The CSA toured each institution and facility to personally observe incumbents performing their jobs and evaluate the similarities and differences between the institutions and facilities. Job incumbents were asked to rate the task and equipment items based on their own experience performing the tasks and using the equipment while on the job, while supervisors were asked to provide ratings based on their supervisory experience of COs, YCOs, and YCCs performing the tasks and using the equipment. The CSA included both incumbents and supervisory staff in order to get a balanced perspective regarding job tasks and equipment.

To ensure that consistent, thorough instructions for completing the JAQ were provided to each group of SMEs, the CSA developed a presentation to be provided prior to survey administration. The presentation included an overview of the CSA and its responsibilities, the purpose of the job analysis, and instructions for filling out the survey. SMEs completed the survey in groups presided over by a CSA survey administrator.

Table 4. JAQ Participants

Classification Rating	Current Classification	Expected Frequency	Obtained Frequency	Valid Percent of the Total by Classification
Correctional Officer	Correctional Officer	242	231	71.7
	Correctional Sergeant	104	91	28.3
	Total	345	322	100.0
Youth Correctional Officer	Youth Correctional Officer	111	101	91.0
	Youth Correctional Sergeant	14	10	9.0
	Total	125	111	100.0
Youth Correctional Counselor	Youth Correctional Counselor	112	94	87.9
	Senior Youth Correctional Counselor	16	13	21.1
	Total	128	107	100.0
Missing*			4	

Note. * Indicates participants that did not indicate their current classification and are not used in further analyses.

From the Division of Adult Institutions (DAI), 231 of the expected 242 COs and 91 of the expected 104 Correctional Sergeants participated in the survey. These two classifications have been combined and represent those participants rating the job classification of CO. Actual participants with the job title of CO made up 71.7 percent of those who rated this classification. The other 28.3 percent of the people rating the CO job classification were Supervisors or Correctional Sergeants.

From the DJJ, 101 of the expected 111 YCOs and 10 of the expected 15 Youth Correctional Sergeants participated in the survey. These two classifications were combined and represent those individuals rating the YCO position. Ninety-one percent of those rating the YCO position were actual individuals holding that job classification. The remaining nine percent were the Supervisors or Youth Correctional Sergeants.

Of the YCCs, 94 of the expected 112 participated, and 13 of the expected 16 Senior Youth Correctional Counselors participated as well. To rate the job classification of YCC, those with the job classification of YCC and Senior YCC were combined. Actual participants with the job classification of YCC made up 87.9 percent of those rating this classification. The other 21.1 percent of those rating the YCC job classification were Supervisors or Senior YCCs.

There were four participants that did not indicate their current classification. These individuals will not be used in any further analyses since all analyses performed are based on the three classifications being rated; CO, YCO, and YCC.

The JAQ collected data on 13 additional demographic elements (Table 5). See Appendix J for the complete demographic analysis.

Table 5. JAQ Demographic Elements

1. Age
2. Ethnicity
3. Gender
4. Assigned Facility
5. Education
6. Years in Current Classification
7. Current Watch
8. Length of Academy Attended
9. Apprenticeship Completed
10. Primary Area of Responsibility
11. Years as a Correctional Peace Officer
12. Total Facilities Worked In
13. Time-Base

C. Rater Response Bias

Prior to analyzing the data obtained from the JAQ, each individual's responses were examined to determine rater response bias. Rater response bias is observed when a respondent appears to be carelessly selecting the same response to the questions for the majority of the tasks. A frequency count for the three responses, "Task is not Part of Job," "Less than a Majority," and "A Majority," was conducted. Raters that consistently selected only one of the three response options were flagged as well as those who used the rating of "Task is not Part of Job" approximately half of the time. The raters' responses were examined for question A, "Based on your experience in the facilities in which you've worked, how many entry-level correctional peace officers will perform this task in the first three years on the job (even if they do it only a few times)?" as well as question B, "How likely is it that their would be serious negative consequences if this task is NOT performed or if it is performed incorrectly?"

Eight raters were considered biased for both question A and question B and therefore eliminated from all future analyses. Four of the eight raters eliminated from future analyses responded to question A, by selecting the response "A Majority" for more than 80 percent of the tasks. Two of the eight raters eliminated from future analyses responded to question A by selecting the response "Less than a Majority" for more 80 percent of the tasks. The last two eliminated raters responded to question A by selecting "Task Not Part of Job" for approximately half of the tasks and "Less than a Majority" for most of the remaining tasks, rarely responding with "A Majority." These eight raters had similar response bias for their B ratings.

The responses of the raters were also examined for question B , revealing that there was more rater response bias for question B than for question A, which may have been due to misinterpretation of the wording of the question. Approximately 40 percent of the raters selected the same response for question B as they did for question A more than 80 percent of the time. The raters' responses were kept for question A; however, a new variable was created so that the response bias could be controlled for while analyzing responses to question B. All future analyses conducted on the question B ratings do not include these raters. The individuals found to have response bias were examined according to the current classification they were rating to ensure that they were represented among the three classifications. Approximately 43 percent of those rating the classification of CO exhibited response bias on the B question ratings, approximately 38 percent of those rating the classification of YCO exhibited response bias on the B question rating, and

approximately 33 percent of those rating the classification of YCC exhibited response bias on the B question rating.

Following the analysis examining rater response bias, analyses were run for all of the task and equipment items in order to determine if any tasks were not endorsed and therefore should not move forward to be linked to the KSAOs. A descriptive statistics procedure, known as crosstabs, was used to look at the overall ratings for the task and equipment items based on the classification that the participants were rating. The crosstabs tables provide total counts for each of the responses selected, as well as the percentages, and indicate how a task was rated overall and by the classification of the respondents rating it. The complete crosstabs analysis can be found in Appendix K.

The crosstabs tables were examined for all 291 tasks and 83 equipment items for question A from the JAQ. During this portion of the analysis question A was examined in order to determine what tasks were not performed in general. If the respondent selected the response "Task Not Part of Job" for question A, then they were also instructed to select it for question B. The results of the analysis indicated that some of respondents may not have understood these directions, and subsequently, many of the responses had to be recoded to reflect the instructions to ensure correct interpretations of the results. The tasks and equipment items were examined to determine whether they were not endorsed by any or all of the classifications being rated. In order for a task to be considered as not being endorsed for one of the classifications, 85 percent or more of the individuals rating that classification had to have selected the response "Task Not Part of Job." For a task not endorsed by all three classifications, 85 percent or more of the individuals rating the classification selected the response "Task Not Part of Job." Only six tasks were not endorsed by any of the classifications based on the 85 percent cutoff and were completely eliminated from any further analyses. Additionally, there were five equipment items that were not endorsed by any of the classifications and also eliminated based on the 85 percent cutoff. Two more equipment items were eliminated from future analyses after a review of current practices and policies indicated that the items are no longer used. The six tasks and the eight equipment items eliminated can be found in Table 6.

Table 6. Eliminated Tasks & Equipment Items.

Category	Task/Equipment Item
Booking, Receiving and Releasing	Process bail.
Casework	Process applications for alternative sentencing programs.
Health and Medical	Distribute medication.
	Weigh wards/inmates.
Investigation	Administer a breath analyzer test to wards/inmates.
Supervision of Non-Inmates	Supervise infants only (no adult visitors present).
Equipment	Auto mechanics tool kit
	Briefcase*
	Cash register
	Jaws of life
	Paddy wagon
	Taser/stun gun
	Teletype*

Note. * indicates that these items were eliminated for policy reasons rather than because of the 85 percent rater agreement that the "Item is not used on the Job."

In addition, many tasks and equipment items were not endorsed by one or two of the classifications being rated. These items were left as items to be linked to KSAOs; however, they were only linked by the classifications that endorsed them. There were a total of 10 additional tasks that were not endorsed by COs and 13 tasks and 8 equipment items that were not endorsed by YCOs based on the

85 percent cutoff (Table 7). Additionally, there were 4 tasks and 6 equipment items that were not endorsed by YCCs based on the 85 percent cutoff.

Table 7. Tasks Not Endorsed by Classification

Classification	Category	Item
Correctional Officer	Booking, Receiving and Releasing	Discuss charges against juvenile with arresting/transporting officer.
	Casework	Conduct a home study where juveniles are to be released.
		Coordinate with external resources for ward/inmate employment and rehabilitation services.
		Develop counseling and treatment plans.
		Manage casework.
		Notify parents/guardians of changes in ward status.
		Recommend ward/inmate program advancement or graduation.
		Recommend wards/inmates for pretrial or alternative programs.
		Recommend whether to release or hold wards/inmates.
	Emergencies	Handle canines to control crowds.
Youth Correctional Officer	Booking, Receiving and Releasing	Run warrant checks, holds and search clauses.
	Casework	Assign wards/inmates to program/counselor.
		Conduct a home study where juveniles are to be released.
		Coordinate with external resources for ward/inmate employment and rehabilitation services.
		Notify parents/guardians of changes in ward status.
		Recommend ward/inmate program advancement or graduation.
		Recommend wards/inmates for pretrial or alternative programs.
	Court-Related Board Hearings	Conduct closed circuit video arraignments.
	General Duties	Operate facility canteen.
		Prepare meals.
	Supervision of Wards/Inmates	Issue "Toussaint Package."
	Written Communication	Process deceased inmates.
		Request Department of Justice (DOJ) criminal history.
	Equipment	Breath analysis or other equipment for alcohol detection.
		Food preparation equipment (e.g., stove, broilers, ovens).
		Microfilm/Microfiche machine.
		Power supply generators.
		Restraint WRAP.
		Rifle.
		Shotgun.
		X-ray equipment (examining mail and packages).
Youth Correctional Counselor	Booking, Receiving and Releasing	Run warrant checks, holds and search clauses.
	Court-Related Board Hearings	Conduct closed circuit video arraignments.
	General Duties	Operate facility canteen.
	Written Communication	Process deceased inmates.
	Equipment	Breath analysis or other equipment for alcohol detection.
		Food preparation equipment (e.g., stove, broilers, ovens).
		Microfilm/Microfiche machine.
		PBX Switchboard.
		Rifle.
		Shotgun.

D. JAQ Results

The results from the JAQ were analyzed to determine which tasks were considered "core" for the three classifications, which were considered "support," and which were deemed "other." The core tasks are those that many of the respondents selected to be done frequently on the job and those for which there would be serious negative consequence if the task were performed incorrectly. The support tasks are those that are performed less frequently and for which there are less serious negative consequences associated with incorrect performance. Finally, the tasks labeled as other are those that are performed fairly infrequently, and typically would not have a negative consequence if performed incorrectly. The mean for each task was calculated both for question A, which asks about the frequency of the task being performed, and for question B, which asks whether or not there would be serious negative consequences if performed incorrectly. The scale for each question ranged from zero to two: zero indicates that the task was not part of the job, one indicates that the task was performed infrequently for question A and that it was not likely that there would be serious negative consequences for question B, and two indicates that the task was done frequently for question A and that there would be serious negative consequences if performed incorrectly for question B.

The mean for the frequency rating was multiplied by the mean for the consequence rating yielding a criticality score for all tasks. The tasks that yielded a criticality score of 1.73 or above were deemed core tasks overall. The tasks that yielded a criticality score between 1.72 and 0.56 were considered support tasks overall. Tasks that received a criticality score of 0.55 or below were considered other tasks overall. The score ranges are the same for the equipment items. The criticality scores were examined according to classification. The results of the analyses based on the task category can be found in Tables 8 – 27, following a description for each. The categories have been presented based on how many tasks within the category are core. Categories where the majority of the tasks are core are discussed first.

Task Category: Search
For the task category of Search, tasks across all three classifications were rated as core (Table 8). The tasks that comprise the category of Search are as follows: "Confiscate contraband"; "Search individuals, property, supplies, areas, and vehicles"; "Identify contraband"; "Dispose of contraband"; and "Perform a contraband watch."

Table 8. Search Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
166	Confiscate contraband.	3.41	3.36	3.64
170	Search individuals, property, supplies, areas, and vehicles.	3.31	3.30	3.45
168	Identify contraband.	3.18	3.29	3.28
167	Dispose of contraband.	3.12	2.70	2.68
196	Perform a contraband watch.	2.46	2.29	2.04

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Restraints and Use of Force
For the task category of Restraints and Use of Force, the following tasks were rated as core tasks by all three classifications: "Apply mechanical restraints"; "Use departmentally approved 'use of force' methods"; "Discharge chemical agents to control resistant inmates or quell disturbances/riots"; "Separate fighting wards/inmates"; "Restrain an assaultive ward/inmate"; "Apply physical

restraints"; "Apply/discharge less lethal or lethal force to defend oneself/others"; "Defend oneself against an armed ward/inmate"; "Disarm and subdue an armed ward/inmate"; and "Perform cell extractions" (Table 9). The task "Discharge firearms" was rated a core task for the CO and is considered to be a support task for the YCO and YCC.

Table 9. Restraints and Use of Force Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
249	Apply mechanical restraints.	3.60	3.68	3.57
259	Use departmentally approved "use of force" methods.	3.44	3.83	3.74
254	Discharge chemical agents to control resistant inmates or quell disturbances/riots.	3.17	3.56	3.68
258	Separate fighting wards/inmates.	3.13	3.50	3.58
257	Restrain an assaultive ward/inmate.	3.11	3.30	3.36
250	Apply physical restraints.	3.06	3.47	3.25
251	Apply/discharge less lethal or lethal force to defend oneself or others.	2.94	2.98	3.00
252	Defend oneself against an armed ward/inmate.	2.65	2.52	2.53
253	Disarm and subdue an armed ward/inmate.	2.53	2.48	2.32
256	Perform cell extractions.	2.45	2.62	2.32
255	Discharge firearms.	2.39	1.00	0.69

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Counseling

For the task category of Counseling, the following tasks were rated as core by all three classifications: "Resolve conflicts between wards/inmates"; "Gather information about conflicts or personal problems from wards/inmates"; and "Assist wards/inmates in solving problems" (Table 10). The task "Counsel wards/inmates and update progress to their parole agent" is a core task for the classification of YCC, a support task for the YCO, and an other task for the CO.

Table 10. Counseling Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
31	Resolve conflicts between wards/inmates.	2.58	2.50	3.11
30	Gather information about conflicts or personal problems from wards/inmates.	1.81	1.88	2.82
28	Assist wards/inmates in problem solving.	1.75	2.10	2.76
29	Counsel wards/inmates and update progress to their parole agent.	0.26	1.20	3.00

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Arrests

For the task category of Arrests, the task of "Arrest or detain individuals who commit crimes in the facility" was rated a core task for the CO and YCO and a support task for the YCC (Table 11).

Table 11. Arrests Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
35	Arrest or detain individuals who commit crimes in the facilty.	2.68	1.99	1.70

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Escort, Move, Transportation
For the task category of Escort, Move, Transportation, the following tasks were rated as core tasks for all three classifications: "Escort wards/inmates within and outside the facility"; "Move wards/inmates in and out of areas"; "Inform central control of ward/inmate movement"; "Move wards/inmates in and out of cells"; "Use ward/inmate daily movement sheet"; "Issue passes/ducats to wards/inmates"; "Escort medical professionals who are providing medical services to wards/inmates"; and "Evaluate ward's/inmate's potential security risk prior to transport" (Table 12). The following tasks were rated as core tasks for the CO and YCO and are considered support tasks for the YCC: "Monitor all individuals and vehicle movement inside, outside and in the immediate area of the facility"; "Transport injured wards/inmates"; "Process vehicles entering, leaving or within the facility"; "Prepare wards/inmates for transportation to court, hospital, etc."; "Escort vehicle(s) during emergency and/or high security transport"; and "Transport equipment, supplies or evidence." The task "Transport wards/inmates individually and in groups outside the facility" was rated as core for the CO and is deemed a support task for the YCO and YCC. The final task in the Escort, Move, Transportation category, "Plan transportation route," is considered a support task for all three classifications.

Table 12. Escort, Move, Transportation Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
52	Escort wards/inmates within and outside the facility.	3.13	3.04	2.85
64	Move wards/inmates in and out of areas.	2.98	3.07	3.49
54	Inform central control of ward/inmate movement.	2.95	3.45	3.55
65	Move wards/inmates in and out of cells.	2.90	3.27	3.51
62	Use ward/inmate daily movement sheet.	2.66	2.09	2.99
55	Monitor all individuals and vehicle movement inside, outside and in the immediate area of the facility.	2.53	2.55	1.59
60	Transport injured wards/inmates.	2.48	2.46	1.53
63	Issue passes/ducats to wards/inmates.	2.47	2.33	2.82
56	Process vehicles entering, leaving or within the facility.	2.36	2.17	1.14
58	Prepare wards/inmates for transportation to court, hospital, etc.	2.31	1.90	1.50
51	Escort vehicle(s) during emergency and/or high security transport.	2.24	2.03	1.12
61	Transport wards/inmates individually and in groups outside the facility.	2.22	1.60	1.37
50	Escort medical professionals who are providing medical services to wards/inmates.	2.10	2.05	1.76
53	Evaluate ward's/inmate's potential security risk before transport.	2.09	2.35	2.16
59	Transport equipment, supplies and evidence.	2.01	1.93	1.24
57	Plan transportation route.	1.32	0.99	0.59

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Referrals
For the task category of Referrals, the following tasks are determined to be core tasks for all three classifications: "Identify wards/inmates in need of medical or psychiatric care"; "Obtain assistance for wards/inmates in need of medical or psychiatric care"; and "Make appropriate referrals" (Table 13). The final task in this category, "Advocate for urgent services for wards/inmates," is considered a support task for all three classifications.

Table 13. Referrals Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
163	Identify wards/inmates need of medical or psychiatric care.	2.73	2.36	2.65
165	Obtain assistance for wards/inmates in need of medical, dental or psychiatric care	2.58	2.31	2.82
164	Make appropriate referrals.	2.22	1.94	2.44
162	Advocate for urgent services for wards/inmates.	1.36	1.13	1.47

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Security

For the task category of Security, the following tasks are considered core tasks for all three classifications: "Count wards/inmates verifying living, breathing flesh"; "Account for facility keys"; "Verify ward/inmate identity"; "Account for and secure tools and equipment"; "Report ward/inmate count and wait for an all clear from central control"; "Check doors and windows"; "Account for location and status of wards/inmates"; "Verify ward/inmate count"; "Perform perimeter and security checks"; "Check areas for unauthorized illegal activities"; "Check in and out equipment and supplies"; "Activate personal and/or control center alarm"; "Operate/secure gates, doors, locks, and sallyports"; "Sign in and out of the facility"; "Call for back-up"; "Maintain confidentiality of information"; "Process wards/inmates leaving a security area"; "Report inmate count discrepancies"; "Test all equipment to ensure proper functioning"; "Verify identification badges and passes"; "Account for location and status of staff within and outside the facility"; "Conduct metal detection screening of visitors"; "Apprehend escaped wards/inmates"; and "Issue identification badges and passes" (Table 14).

The following tasks are all considered core tasks for the CO and YCO and determined as support tasks for the YCC: "Monitor all persons entering, leaving, and within the facility"; "Authorize persons entering and exiting the facility"; "Protect the security of courtrooms, hospitals, and other external locations when wards/inmates are present"; "Update count of visitors entering and leaving the facility"; "Admit and release visitors"; "Screen visitors against approved visitor list and enforce visiting dress code"; and "Inspect and document vehicle safety and operating condition." The following tasks are all determined to be core tasks for the CO classification and are considered support tasks for the YCO and YCC: "Inspect weapons and ammunition"; "Conduct fire, safety, area and sanitation inspections"; "Log weapons/guns in and out"; "Use stamp and black light to identify visitors"; and "Monitor the zone control panel." The tasks "Inspect food for contamination and/or tampering" and "Monitor outside radio transmissions and radio nets" are considered support tasks for all three classifications. Finally, the task "Compare fingerprints/palmprints to verify identification of wards/inmates" was determined to be a support task for the CO and an other task for the YCO and YCC.

Table 14. Security Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
181	Count wards/inmates, verify living, breathing flesh.	3.80	3.72	3.86
171	Account for facility keys.	3.72	2.90	2.99
202	Verify ward/inmate identity.	3.63	3.33	3.80
194	Account for and secure tools and equipment.	3.56	3.01	3.01
200	Report ward/inmate count and wait for all clear from central control.	3.54	3.67	3.69
176	Check doors and windows.	3.54	3.62	3.65
198	Account for location and status of wards/inmates.	3.53	3.72	3.82
201	Verify ward/inmate count.	3.52	3.51	3.88
190	Perform perimeter and security checks.	3.48	3.36	2.67
175	Check areas for unauthorized or illegal activity.	3.47	3.40	3.43
177	Check in and out equipment and supplies.	3.38	2.66	2.96
172	Activate personal and/or control center alarm.	3.37	3.27	3.51
189	Operate/secure gates, doors, locks, and sallyports.	3.37	3.02	2.39
195	Sign in and out of the facility.	3.35	3.45	3.63
174	Call for back-ups.	3.33	3.45	3.58
184	Inspect weapons and ammunition.	3.26	1.31	0.97
208	Maintain confidentiality of information.	3.24	3.20	3.02
191	Process wards/inmates leaving a security area.	3.21	3.12	2.24
193	Report ward/inmate count discrepancies.	3.12	3.30	3.09
196	Test all equipment to ensure proper functioning.	3.10	3.11	3.14
199	Verify identification badges and passes.	3.01	2.50	2.78
186	Monitor all persons entering, leaving and within the facility.	2.90	2.41	1.50
173	Authorize persons entering and exiting the facility.	2.77	1.85	1.39
179	Conduct fire, safety, area and sanitation inspections.	2.65	1.27	1.59
209	Account for location and status of staff within and outside the facility.	2.64	2.76	2.35
185	Log weapons/guns in and out.	2.54	1.27	0.71
192	Protect the security of courtrooms, hospitals and other external locations when wards/inmates are present.	2.53	1.82	1.24
197	Update count of visitors entering and leaving the facility.	2.27	2.11	1.58
204	Admit and release visitors.	2.24	2.27	1.41
180	Conduct metal detection screening of visitors.	2.18	2.53	1.74
206	Screen visitors against approved visitor list and enforce visiting dress code.	2.13	2.30	1.41
203	Apprehend escaped wards/inmates.	2.02	1.98	1.75
207	Use stamp and black light to identify visitors.	2.00	1.49	0.87
183	Inspect and document vehicle safety and operating condition.	1.92	2.42	1.42
205	Issue identification badges and passes.	1.87	1.97	1.87
188	Monitor the zone control panel.	1.73	1.03	0.90
182	Inspect food for contamination and/or tampering.	1.50	0.74	1.02
187	Monitor outside radio transmissions and radio nets	0.86	0.74	0.75
178	Compare fingerprints/palmprints to verify identification of wards/inmates.	0.64	0.36	0.34

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Supervision of Wards/Inmates
For the task category of Supervision of Wards/Inmates, the following tasks are considered core tasks for all three classifications: "Supervise wards/inmates"; "Confront wards/inmates exhibiting inappropriate behavior"; "Intervene in/break up physical altercations"; "Identify wards/inmates"; "Identify violent wards/inmates"; "Identify potential disturbances/riot situations"; "Intervene in ward/inmate disputes to de-escalate a potentially violent conflict"; "Monitor ward/inmate activity"; "Monitor behavior changes of individual wards/inmates or groups to identify potential problems or disturbances"; "Maintain ward/inmate discipline"; "Monitor wards/inmates for signs of alcohol or drugs use/abuse and document any issues"; "Supervise ward/inmate cell and area moves"; "Monitor changes in ward's/inmate's mental, physical and emotional condition"; "Monitor wards/inmates in safety cell, sobering cells, crisis rooms/center or restraints"; "Verify ownership of property in ward's/inmate's possession"; "Monitor ward/inmate phone calls"; "Prevent unauthorized ward/inmate communication"; "Observe wards/inmates taking medication"; "Administer disciplinary action against wards/inmates"; "Implement suicide watch procedures"; "Identify homosexual behavior"; "Encourage wards/inmates through positive feedback"; and "Evaluate wards/inmates" (Table 15).

The following tasks are considered core tasks for the CO and YCC and are support tasks for the classification of YCO: "Identify gang affiliation and implement processing procedures"; "Identify wards/inmates with disabilities and assist them"; "Obtain wards/inmates signatures on form." The following tasks were determined to be core tasks for the YCC and considered support tasks for the CO and YCO: "Obtain and process urine samples"; "Arrange daily schedules of wards/ inmates"; and "Recommend ward/inmate work assignments."

The following tasks were determined to be support tasks for all three classifications: "Hire wards/inmates for work detail"; "Permit incoming wards/inmates to receive incoming phone calls"; and "Assist wards/inmates with paperwork/schoolwork." The task "Issue Toussaint package" is considered a support task for the CO classification and an other task for the YCO and YCC. The final task in this category, "Plan on- and off-grounds activities for wards/inmates" was determined to be a support task for the YCC and considered an other task for the remaining CO and YCO.

Table 15. Supervision of Wards/Inmates Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
247	Supervise wards/inmates.	3.48	3.87	3.90
220	Confront wards/inmates exhibiting inappropriate behavior.	3.42	3.62	3.70
219	Intervene in/break up physical altercations.	3.41	3.77	3.71
228	Identify wards/inmates.	3.38	3.16	3.54
227	Identify violent wards/inmates.	3.29	3.00	3.62
226	Identify potential disturbances/riot situations.	3.25	3.00	3.50
229	Intervene in ward/inmate disputes to deescalate a potentially violent conflict.	3.25	3.20	3.54
234	Monitor ward/inmate activity.	3.14	3.12	3.60
232	Monitor behavior changes of individual wards/inmates or groups to identify potential problems or disturbances.	3.13	3.15	3.58
231	Maintain ward/inmate discipline.	3.08	2.95	3.59
236	Monitor wards/inmates for signs of alcohol or drug use/abuse and document any issues.	2.99	2.97	3.39
245	Supervise ward/inmate cell and area moves.	2.96	3.09	3.43
233	Monitor changes in wards'/inmates' mental, physical and emotional condition.	2.88	2.88	3.35
237	Monitor wards/inmates in safety cells, sobering cells, crisis rooms/center or restraints.	2.67	2.98	3.08
246	Verify ownership of property in ward's/inmate's possession.	2.63	2.24	2.74
235	Monitor ward/inmate phone calls.	2.44	1.74	2.51
243	Prevent unauthorized ward/inmate communication.	2.34	2.60	3.21
224	Identify gang affiliation and implement processing procedures.	2.06	1.61	2.59
217	Identify wards/inmates with disabilities and assist them.	1.97	1.50	2.11
238	Observe wards/inmates taking medication.	1.96	2.15	2.17
215	Administer disciplinary action against wards/inmates.	1.92	2.45	3.04
240	Obtain wards/inmates signature on forms.	1.90	1.57	2.39
248	Implement suicide watch procedures.	1.84	2.48	2.86
225	Identify homosexual behavior.	1.84	1.94	2.42
221	Encourage wards/inmates through positive feedback.	1.83	2.44	2.87
222	Evaluate wards/inmates.	1.83	1.89	2.81
239	Obtain and process urine samples.	1.72	1.27	1.93
216	Arrange daily schedules of wards/inmates.	1.30	1.28	2.46
244	Recommend ward/inmate work assignments.	1.27	0.99	1.98
223	Hire wards/inmates for work detail.	1.20	0.87	1.68
241	Permit incoming wards/inmates to receive incoming phone calls.	0.78	0.73	0.81
218	Assist wards/inmates with paperwork/schoolwork.	0.73	0.83	1.71
230	Issue "Toussaint Package."	0.61	0.17	0.33
242	Plan on and off grounds activities for wards/inmates.	0.34	0.55	1.07

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Emergencies

For the task category of Emergencies, the following tasks are considered core tasks for all three classifications: "Report emergencies"; "Respond to disturbances or emergencies within or outside the facility"; "Control hostile groups, disturbances, and riots"; "Search for missing wards/inmates inside or outside the facility"; "Intervene in ward/inmate attempt at suicide"; "Conduct emergency and disaster drills"; "Evacuate individuals during emergencies"; and "Dispatch help in emergencies

or disturbances within or outside the facility" (Table 16). The task, "Extinguish fires," was determined to be a core task for the CO and YCO and is a support task for the YCC. The task, "Clean up contaminated or hazardous material," was rated a core task for the CO and rated a support task for the remaining classifications. The tasks "Implement facility lockdown" and "Implement emergency procedures/disaster plan" were rated as support tasks for all three classifications. The task "Negotiate hostage release" was rated a support task for the CO and an other task for the YCO and YCC. The final task, "Handle canines to control crowds," was rated an other task for all three classifications. Although this task could potentially have serious negative consequences if performed incorrectly, it is considered an other task because only a select few officers in the State are trained to perform this task.

Table 16. Emergencies Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
46	Report emergencies.	3.41	3.42	3.58
47	Respond to disturbances or emergencies within or outside the facility.	3.19	3.32	3.40
38	Control hostile groups, disturbances, and riots.	3.10	3.45	3.39
48	Search for missing wards/inmates inside or outside the facility.	2.50	2.58	2.55
45	Intervene in ward/inmate attempt at suicide.	2.44	2.66	2.67
37	Conduct emergency and disaster drills.	2.37	1.74	1.91
40	Evacuate individuals during emergencies.	2.35	2.24	2.11
36	Clean up contaminated or hazardous material.	2.34	1.29	1.51
39	Dispatch help in emergencies or disturbances within or outside the facility.	2.27	2.03	1.96
41	Extinguish fires.	1.90	1.75	1.57
44	Implement facility lockdown.	1.65	1.35	1.17
43	Implement emergency procedures/disaster plan.	1.40	1.13	1.43
49	Negotiate hostage release.	0.63	0.36	0.49
42	Handle canines to control crowds.	0.19	0.27	0.41

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Oral Communication
For the task category of Oral Communication, the following tasks are considered core tasks for all three classifications: "Follow oral instructions"; "Notify supervisors of potential emergencies/hazards"; "Communicate orally"; "Inform relief staff of facility events during shift change"; "Give oral instructions and reports"; "Alert staff members of ward/inmate behavior changes"; "Use radio codes to communicate with staff"; "Communicate with central control"; "Explain institutional policies, procedures and services to wards/inmates"; "Answer phone calls"; "Confer with staff, specialists and others regarding wards/inmates"; "Notify wards/inmates of visitors"; and "Inform visitors and staff of facility facts, policies and procedures individually or in groups" (Table 17). The tasks "Communicate with external departments" and "Communicate orally in a foreign language" are determined to be support tasks for all three classifications. The final task in the category of Oral Communication, "Translate foreign languages into English," is considered a support task for the CO and YCC and deemed as an other task for the YCO.

Table 17. Oral Communication Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
146	Follow oral instructions.	3.31	3.31	3.62
150	Notify supervisors of potential emergencies/hazards.	3.30	3.38	3.29
140	Communicate orally.	3.17	3.05	3.31
148	Inform relief staff of facility events during shift change.	3.13	3.29	3.47
147	Give oral instructions and reports.	3.04	3.12	3.36
138	Alert staff members of ward/inmate behavior changes.	2.95	3.22	3.37
153	Use radio codes to communicate with staff.	2.94	3.16	3.21
142	Communicate with central control.	2.87	3.03	3.28
145	Explain policies, procedures and services to wards/inmates.	2.69	2.42	2.94
139	Answer phone calls.	2.51	2.67	2.86
144	Confer with staff, specialists and others regarding wards/inmates.	2.20	2.21	2.75
151	Notify wards/inmates of visitors.	2.15	2.06	2.59
149	Inform visitors and staff of facility facts, policies and procedures individually or in groups.	2.01	2.11	1.95
143	Communicate with external departments .	1.10	0.84	1.19
141	Communicate orally in a foreign language.	0.98	0.63	0.86
152	Translate foreign languages into English.	0.85	0.55	0.76

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Health and Medical
For the task category of Health and Medical, the following tasks are determined to be core tasks for all three classifications: "Implement safety/heat precautions for wards/inmates on psychotropic medications"; "Comply with Prison Rape Elimination Act guidelines"; "Decontaminate wards/inmates after use of chemical agent"; "Report changes in ward/inmate physical, mental and emotional condition"; "Identify the immediate need for medical treatment"; "Secure area around ward/inmate during an epileptic seizure or other medical emergency to prevent injury"; "Dispose of contaminated or hazardous material"; "Apply CPR"; and "Apply first aid" (Table 18). The task "Prepare injured individuals for transport" is considered a core task for the CO classification and a support task for the YCO and YCC. The task "Verify the wards/inmates receive food for special diets" is determined to be a core task for the YCC and deemed to be a support task for the CO and YCO. The tasks "Verify medication prescribed to wards/inmates is authorized" and "Screen wards/inmates to determine if medical/mental health attention is needed before intake/booking" are considered support for all three classifications. The final task in the Health and Medical category, "Implement procedures for dealing with pregnant female offenders," is rated as a support task for the CO and YCC and considered an other task for the YCO.

Table 18. Health and Medical Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
120	Implement safety/heat precautions for wards/inmates on psychotropic medications.	2.96	2.02	2.66
119	Comply with Prison Rape Elimination Act guidelines	2.91	2.55	2.92
118	Decontaminate wards/inmates after use of chemical agent.	2.80	3.32	3.22
112	Report changes in ward/inmate physical, mental and emotional condition.	2.56	2.35	2.96
110	Identify the immediate need for medical treatment.	2.55	2.46	2.65
114	Secure area around ward/inmate during an epileptic seizure or other medical emergency to prevent injury.	2.24	1.86	1.94
108	Dispose of contaminated or hazardous material.	2.17	1.89	2.04
106	Apply CPR.	1.95	2.22	2.14
107	Apply first aid.	1.94	2.13	1.94
111	Prepare injured individuals for transport.	1.81	1.59	1.39
116	Verify that wards/inmates receive food for special diets.	1.61	1.41	2.32
115	Verify medication prescribed to wards/inmates is authorized.	1.47	0.67	1.14
113	Screen wards/inmates to determine if medical/mental health attention is needed before intake/booking.	0.66	0.89	0.69
121	Implement procedures for dealing with pregnant females offenders.	0.63	0.55	0.66

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Investigations

For the task category of Investigation, the following tasks are considered core tasks for all three classifications: "Preserve evidence/chain of custody"; "Preserve crime scene"; "Identify evidence"; "Preserve contraband"; "Identify crime scenes"; "Identify suspicious odors that require investigation" (Table 19). The tasks "Investigating ward/inmate injuries"; "Interview wards/inmates as part of an investigation"; "Gather information for disciplinary proceedings"; "Implementing ward/inmate due process procedures" are deemed to be core tasks for both the CO and YCC and are considered support tasks for the YCO. The task "Process evidence" is determined to be a core task for the CO and YCC and a support task for the YCO. The tasks "Investigating accidents or crimes that occur within the facility"; "Develop ward/inmate informants"; "Investigate disciplinary reports" are considered support tasks for all three classifications. The final task in this category is "Assist police in their investigation of crimes" and is determined to be a support task for the CO and YCC and an other task for the YCO.

Table 19. Investigation Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
136	Preserve evidence/chain of custody.	2.74	2.62	2.92
135	Preserve crime scene.	2.72	2.15	2.50
137	Process evidence.	2.64	1.68	1.92
127	Identify evidence.	2.58	2.24	2.58
134	Preserve contraband.	2.56	2.32	2.81
126	Identify crime scenes.	2.41	1.77	1.96
128	Identify suspicious odors that require investigation.	2.31	2.26	2.47
133	Investigate ward/inmate injuries.	1.96	1.16	1.85
130	Interview wards/inmates as part of an investigation.	1.92	0.93	2.02
125	Gather information for disciplinary proceedings.	1.88	1.15	1.94
129	Implement ward/inmate due process procedures.	1.75	1.00	1.87
131	Investigate accidents or crimes that occur within the facility.	1.72	0.93	1.47
124	Develop ward/inmate informants.	1.32	0.61	1.12
132	Investigate disciplinary reports.	1.26	0.64	0.96
123	Assist police in their investigation of crimes.	0.72	0.46	0.62

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Written Communication

For the task category of Written Communication, the following tasks are considered core tasks for all three classifications: "Document inspections and security checks"; "Document the condition or security of perimeter structures, weapons, or equipment"; "Document ward/inmate rule violations"; "Complete paperwork and forms"; "Document ward/inmate injuries"; "Document ward/inmate movement and activities"; "Document changes in ward's/inmate's mental and physical condition"; "Request repairs to facility and/or equipment"; "Document confidential information offered by wards/inmates"; "Document whether ward/inmate takes or refuses medication or food"; and "Update logs, documents, records and files" (Table 20). The following tasks are determined to be core tasks for the YCO and YCC and considered support tasks for the CO: "Notification of the sender and receiver of the confiscation of contraband"; "Documenting ward/inmate visits"; "Preparing ward/inmate passes," and "Typing reports/forms/correspondence." The task of "Using basic math" is deemed to be a core task for the CO and YCC and considered to be a support task for the YCO. The task "Documentation of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the facility" is considered a core task for the CO and YCO and determined to be a support task for the YCC. The task "Notifying the housing unit of wards/inmates scheduled for release or transfer" is deemed to be a core task for the classifications of CO and YCC and considered a support task for the YCO. The tasks "Recording all phone calls placed by wards or inmate in a log" and "Storing ward or inmate records" are determined to be core tasks for the YCC and considered support for the CO and YCO.

The following tasks from the Written Communication category have been found to be support tasks for all three classifications: "Writing articles, memos, reports, manuals, and other documents"; "Drawing crime scene diagrams"; "Process ward/inmate money"; "Updating the list of approved ward/inmate visitors"; "Updating the list of allowable items." The tasks "Release of property or money to transferred, released, or paroled ward/inmate"; "Preparing a list of wards/inmates going to court"; and "Documenting ward/inmate trust account information" are all considered support tasks for the CO and YCC and an other task for the YCO. The task requiring "Processing deceased inmates" is determined to be a support task for the CO and considered an other task for the remaining classifications of YCO and YCC. The final task in the Written Communication category is "Requesting the Department of Justice (DOJ) criminal history" is considered to be an other task for all three classifications.

Table 20. Written Communication Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
273	Document inspections and security checks.	3.36	3.02	3.35
275	Document the condition of security or perimeter structures, weapons or equipment.	3.09	2.80	2.24
279	Document ward/inmate rule violations.	3.08	2.84	3.19
261	Complete paperwork and forms.	2.88	2.97	3.39
276	Document ward/inmate injuries.	2.65	2.72	3.22
278	Document ward/inmate movement and activities.	2.61	2.69	3.47
260	Use basic math to calculate various figures for timecards, paysheets, counts, ward incentive program, etc.	2.57	1.53	2.33
271	Document changes in wards'/inmates' mental and physical condition.	2.45	1.84	2.70
285	Request repairs to facility and/or equipment.	2.44	2.12	2.42
272	Document confidential information offered by wards/inmates.	2.42	2.13	2.74
274	Document persons and vehicles entering and leaving facility.	2.33	1.89	1.16
282	Document whether ward/inmate takes or refuses medication or food.	2.30	1.99	2.77
290	Update logs, documents, records and files.	2.29	2.51	3.40
264	Notify housing unit of wards/inmates scheduled for release or transfer.	1.88	1.11	1.77
291	Write articles, memos, reports, manuals and other documents.	1.69	1.14	1.69
265	Notify sender and receiver of the confiscation of contraband.	1.68	1.94	2.18
277	Document ward/inmate medical restrictions.	1.62	1.32	2.26
281	Document ward/inmate visits.	1.61	1.79	2.24
263	File and retrieve documents in record system.	1.60	1.50	2.64
267	Prepare ward/inmate passes or ducats.	1.60	1.79	2.33
262	Draw crime scene diagrams.	1.57	0.90	1.22
270	Record all phone calls placed to or by wards/inmates in a log.	1.56	1.49	2.29
287	Type reports/forms/correspondence.	1.54	2.72	3.12
283	Release property or money to transferred or paroled ward/inmate.	1.27	0.55	0.97
268	Process deceased inmates.	1.13	0.05	0.26
269	Process ward/inmate money.	1.09	0.59	0.60
289	Update list of approved ward/inmate visitors.	0.99	0.59	1.40
266	Prepare a list of wards/inmates going to court.	0.92	0.39	0.91
286	Store ward/inmate records.	0.90	0.59	1.74
288	Update list of allowable items.	0.88	0.79	1.45
280	Document ward/inmate trust account information.	0.59	0.37	1.21
284	Request Department of Justice (DOJ) criminal history.	0.33	0.20	0.55

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Read, Review, and Analyze
For the task category of Read, Review, and Analyze, the tasks "Reviewing and applying provisions of regulations, policies, procedures, and Memorandums of Understanding" and "Reviewing forms and documents for accuracy and completeness" are considered core tasks for all three classifications (Table 21).   The tasks "Reading written and/or electronic documents" and "Interpreting DOJ criminal history reports" are determined to be core tasks for the YCO and YCC and support tasks for the CO. The task "Implementing modified program orders" is considered a core task for the CO and YCC and a support task for the YCO. The task "Reviewing ward/inmate case files" is

determined to be a core task for the YCC and is deemed to be a support task for the remaining classifications, CO and YCO. The task "Reviewing the medical log and making note of medical restrictions" is considered to be a support task for all three classifications. The final task in the task category of Read, Review, and Analyze is "Interpreting DOJ criminal history reports" and is deemed to be a support task for both the CO and YCC and is determined to be an other task for the YCO.

Table 21. Read, Review and Analyze Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
155	Implement modified programs orders.	2.49	1.65	2.31
154	Review and apply provisions of regulations, policies, procedures, and Memorandums of Understanding.	2.37	2.16	2.38
159	Review forms and documents for accuracy and completeness.	1.85	1.94	2.47
158	Read written and/or electronic documents.	1.70	2.01	2.43
156	Interpret common street terminology.	1.63	1.89	2.18
161	Review ward/inmate case files.	1.33	1.06	2.68
160	Review medical log and make note of medical restrictions.	1.01	1.00	1.49
157	Interpret DOJ criminal history reports.	0.62	0.52	1.12

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: General Duties
For the task category of General Duties, the following tasks are considered core tasks for all three classifications: "Attend training"; "Operate communication equipment"; "Instruct wards/inmates"; "Monitor return of food trays and utensils"; "Consult with supervisors"; "Distribute mail, supplies, meals, commissary items equipment, etc."; "Operate safety equipment"; "Respond to ward/inmate questions or requests"; "Operate a vehicle or bicycle"; "Observe blind spots using a curved mirror"; and "Attend staff meetings" (Table 22). The tasks "Inventory of ward/inmate property"; "Processing ward/inmate property"; and "Confiscating and replacing damaged ward/inmate linens and clothing" are determined to be core tasks for the CO and YCC and support tasks for the YCO. The task "Monitoring of ward/inmates and facility using closed circuit television systems" is deemed to be a core task for both the YCO and YCC and is a support task for the CO. The tasks "Inventory and ordering tools, weapons, ammunition, equipment, and supplies"; "Processing mail"; "Serving meals"; "Ordering supplies"; and "Cleaning areas of the facility when wards/inmates are not available" are determined to be core tasks for the CO and support tasks for the YCO and YCC. The tasks "Exchanging ward/inmate linens and clothing" and "Giving instructions to staff" are considered core tasks for the YCC and support tasks for the CO and YCO.

Additionally, the following tasks are support tasks for all three classifications: "Train correctional staff"; "Process ward/inmate grievances and complaints"; "Report food shortages"; "Observe the work of other facility personnel"; "Assign jobs to wards/inmates"; "Operate utility sources such as lighting, power, and water"; "Participate in professional organizations, committees, task forces or work groups"; and "Observe the work of facility staff through peer review." The tasks "Processing law library requests and library books"; "Developing proposals for program, facility or policy improvements"; and "Touring other facilities" are considered support tasks for the CO and YCC and other tasks for the YCO. The task "Raising and lowering the flag" is a support task for both the CO and YCO and an other task for the classification of YCC. The tasks "Approval or disapproval of special purchases for wards/inmates" and "Laundering ward/inmate linens and clothing" are determined to be support tasks for the YCC and other tasks for the CO and YCO. The final tasks in the category of General Duties are "Recruiting job applicants and volunteers, Operating the facility

canteen" and "Serving as a departmental representative to external groups," which are considered other tasks for all three classifications.

Table 22. General Duties Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
68	Attend training.	3.32	3.11	3.31
104	Operate communication equipment.	2.97	3.36	3.31
101	Instruct wards/inmates.	2.85	3.18	3.24
79	Monitor return of food trays and utensils.	2.85	2.45	3.00
70	Consult with supervisors.	2.74	2.72	2.93
75	Distribute mail, supplies, meals, commissary items, equipment, etc.	2.73	1.96	2.83
73	Inventory and order tools, weapons, ammunition, equipment, and supplies.	2.69	1.27	1.65
74	Inventory ward/inmate property.	2.68	1.68	2.43
105	Operate safety equipment.	2.66	2.91	3.08
87	Process mail.	2.58	1.72	1.50
88	Process ward/inmate property.	2.47	1.34	1.80
99	Respond to ward/inmate questions or requests.	2.35	2.06	2.56
80	Operate a vehicle or bicycle.	2.28	2.76	1.80
102	Observe blind spots using a curved mirror.	2.25	2.33	2.22
93	Serve meals.	2.04	1.44	1.72
67	Attend staff meetings.	2.02	1.76	2.45
78	Confiscate and replace damaged ward/inmate linens, and clothing.	1.85	1.50	1.98
83	Order Supplies.	1.81	0.77	1.63
69	Clean areas of the facility when wards/inmates are not available.	1.79	1.26	1.50
72	Exchange ward/inmate linens, and clothing.	1.70	1.36	2.17
95	Give instructions to staff.	1.64	1.51	2.06
100	Train correctional staff.	1.60	1.26	1.53
103	Monitor wards/inmates and facility using closed circuit television systems.	1.58	2.32	2.60
98	Process ward/inmate grievances and complaints.	1.52	0.76	1.23
91	Report food shortages.	1.43	0.82	1.47
97	Observe the work of other facility personnel.	1.28	0.84	1.04
66	Assign jobs to wards/inmates.	1.16	1.01	1.74
85	Prepare meals.	1.05	0.10	0.26
86	Process law library requests, and library books.	0.96	0.21	0.63
82	Operate utility sources such as lighting, power, and water.	0.82	0.90	0.95
71	Develop proposals for program, facility or policy improvements.	0.82	0.46	1.05
84	Participate in professional organizations, committees, task forces or work groups.	0.79	0.80	1.17
89	Raise/lower flag.	0.72	0.99	0.50
94	Tour other facilities.	0.70	0.40	0.58
96	Observe the work of facility staff through peer review.	0.70	0.67	0.79
90	Recruit job applicants and volunteers.	0.54	0.27	0.40
77	Approve or disapprove special purchases for wards/inmates.	0.52	0.53	1.18
81	Operate facility canteen.	0.52	0.11	0.18
92	Serve as a departmental representative to external groups.	0.51	0.35	0.47
76	Launder ward/inmate linens and clothing.	0.50	0.50	0.77

Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Supervision of Non-Inmates
For the task category of Supervision of Non-Inmates, the tasks "Accounting for location and status of visitors" and "Supervising visitors in contact and non-contact visits" are considered core tasks for all three classifications (Table 23). The task "Escorting contract workers, non-custody staff and visitors within the facility" is determined to be a core task for the CO and is considered a support task for the YCO and YCC. "Conducting facility tours" is deemed to be a support task for the CO and is considered an other task for the YCO and YCC.

Table 23. Supervision of Non-Inmates Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
214	Account for location and status of visitors.	2.42	2.52	1.77
213	Supervise visitors in contact and non-contact visits.	2.33	2.35	1.34
211	Escort contract workers, non-custody staff and visitors within the facility.	1.81	1.40	1.13
210	Conduct facility tours.	1.05	0.43	0.48

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Casework
For the task category of Casework, there are no core tasks for all three classifications (Table 24). The tasks "Managing casework" and "Developing counseling and treatment plans" are determined to be core tasks for the classification of YCC and are considered other tasks for the CO and YCO. The task "Making recommendations regarding ward's/inmate's emotional well-being" is deemed to be a core task for the YCC and is a support task for the CO and YCO. The task "Evaluation of ward/inmate progress in programs and/or employment" is considered a core task for the YCC, a support task for the CO, and an other task for the YCO.

In the Casework category the task "Delivering sensitive messages to wards/inmates" is determined to be a support task for all three classifications. Additionally, the task "Monitoring movements of wards/inmates under house arrest" is considered a support task for the YCO and YCC and is an other task for the CO. The tasks "Recommending whether to release or hold wards/inmates"; "Recommending ward/inmate program advancement or graduation"; "Recommending wards/inmates for pretrial or alternative programs"; "Arranging special visits for wards/inmates"; and "Notifying parents/guardians of changes in ward status" are determined to be support tasks for the YCC and are other tasks for the CO and YCO. The final tasks in the category of Casework is "Assigning wards/inmates to program/counselor"; "Coordinating with external resources for ward/inmate employment and rehabilitation services"; and "Conducting a home study where juveniles are to be released" are considered other tasks for all three classifications.

Table 24. Casework Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
21	Manage casework.	0.18	0.38	2.69
19	Evaluate ward/inmate progress in programs and/or employment.	0.75	0.44	2.41
18	Develop counseling and treatment plans.	0.11	0.46	2.34
20	Make recommendations regarding ward's/inmate's emotional well-being.	1.45	0.98	2.24
27	Recommend whether to release or hold wards/inmates.	0.13	0.25	1.68
17	Deliver sensitive messages to wards/inmates.	1.03	0.60	1.44
25	Recommend ward/inmate program advancement or graduation.	0.13	0.20	1.17
26	Recommend wards/inmates for pretrial or alternative programs.	0.11	0.15	0.77
22	Monitor movements of wards/inmates under house arrest.	0.54	0.75	0.76
13	Arrange special visits for wards/inmates.	0.50	0.26	0.68
23	Notify parents/guardians of changes in ward status.	0.06	0.19	0.58
14	Assign wards/inmates to program/counselor.	0.26	0.19	0.46
16	Coordinate with external resources for ward/inmate employment and rehabilitation services.	0.10	0.11	0.44
15	Conduct a home study where juveniles are to be released.	0.03	0.11	0.40

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Court-Related Board Hearings

For the task category of Court-Related Board Hearings, the task "Testifying at legal proceedings" is considered a core task for the CO is a support task for the YCO and YCC (Table 25). The task "Participation in ward/inmate hearings" is determined to be a support task for the CO and YCC and is an other task for the classification of YCO. "Conducting closed circuit video arrangements" is deemed to be an other task for all three classifications.

Table 25. Court-Related Board Hearings Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
34	Testify at legal proceedings.	1.74	1.46	1.38
33	Participate in ward/inmate hearings.	1.18	0.46	0.80
32	Conduct closed circuit video arraignments.	0.47	0.08	0.08

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Task Category: Booking, Receiving, and Releasing

For the task category Booking, Receiving, and Releasing, the task "Processing wards/inmates upon arrival and release" is considered to be a core task for the CO and is a support task for the YCO and YCC (Table 26).   The tasks "Releasing and/or transferring wards/inmates"; "Preparing identification cards or wristbands and give/affix to wards/inmates"; "Obtaining information from arresting/transporting officers and ward/inmate for booking purposes"; and "Conducting initial intake screening/interview" are determined to be support tasks for all three classifications. The task "Classifying wards/inmates" is considered a support task for the YCC is an other task for the CO and YCO.   The following tasks are determined to be other tasks for all three classifications: "Running warrant checks, holds, and search clauses"; "Placing holds on wards/inmates and notify

the department holding warrant"; and "Discussing charges against juvenile with arresting/transporting officer."

Table 26. Booking, Receiving, and Releasing Criticality Scores for Question A

Task Number	Task	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
1	Process wards/inmates upon arrival and release.	2.14	1.28	1.30
11	Release and/or transfer ward/inmate.	1.56	0.98	0.92
7	Photograph wards/inmates.	1.51	0.86	0.54
9	Prepare identification cards or wristbands and give/affix to wards/inmates.	1.46	0.70	0.79
5	Fingerprint and/or palmprint staff and wards/inmates.	1.18	0.61	0.46
6	Obtain information from arresting/transporting officers and ward/inmate for booking purposes.	0.72	0.67	0.56
3	Conduct initial intake screening/interview.	0.68	0.76	1.20
12	Run warrant checks, holds, and search clauses.	0.42	0.17	0.16
8	Place holds on wards/inmates and notify department holding warrant.	0.34	0.28	0.28
2	Classify wards/inmates.	0.34	0.55	0.69
4	Discuss charges against juvenile with arresting/transporting officer.	0.18	0.52	0.45

Note. Core tasks = 1.73 or above; Support tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Other tasks = 0.55 and below.
Note. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

See Appendix L for a summary of core tasks for each classification.

Task Category: Equipment
Different terminology was used for the equipment category to denote the importance of the equipment items. The items that are used frequently and would cause serious negative consequences if used incorrectly are referred to as "primary" items. Items that are used less frequently and do not pose a risk to serious negative consequences are referred to as "secondary" items. The items that are rarely used and would not produce any serious negative consequences are referred to as "tertiary" items. For the equipment category, the following equipment items are considered primary for all three classifications: "Keys"; "Handcuffs"; "Body armor, interior (e.g. protective vests)"; "Mace, tear-gas or OC spray"; "Personal Alarm System"; "Duty belt"; "Infectious disease/AIDS prevention equipment (e.g., gloves)"; "Leg irons"; "Flashlight"; "Telephone"; "Hand-held (two-way) radio or "beeper" radio"; "Alarm system/monitor"; "Traveling chains (hand, wrist, leg, ankle or waist)"; and "Gas mask or self-contained breathing apparatus" (Table 27).

The equipment items of "Metal detector (for individuals, scanners, or grounds)"; "Body armor, exterior (e.g. riot gear, assault shield)"; "Automobile/patrol car"; and "Stationary radio (e.g. dispatch radio)" are considered primary items for the CO and YCO and secondary items for the YCC. The equipment items "First aid kit" and "Computer terminal" are considered primary for the YCO and YCC, and are considered secondary for the CO. The equipment item "Impact weapon (e.g., baton, etc.)" is considered a primary item for the CO, a secondary item for the YCO, and a tertiary item for YCC. The equipment items "Speed loader/magazine"; "Whistle"; "Rifle"; and "Handgun" are considered primary items for CO and "tertiary" tasks for the other two classifications. The equipment items "Spit mask"; "Public address system/intercom"; "Photocopier; Xerox machine"; and "Housekeeping equipment (e.g., mop, broom, etc.)" are considered a primary item for the CO, and a secondary item for the other two classifications. The equipment item "Bus/van" is considered a primary item for the CO and secondary items for the

other two classifications. The equipment item "Pepper ball gun" is considered a primary item for the YCO, a secondary item for the YCC, and a tertiary item for the CO. The equipment item "Casework Folder (field book)" is considered primary for the YCC and is a tertiary item for the YCO and CO.

The equipment items ".37 mm gas gun"; "Firefighting equipment (e.g., extinguisher, hoses)"; "Emergency lighting equipment (e.g., search lights, flares)"; "Audiovisual equipment (video taping)"; "Property storage lockers"; "Adding machine/calculator"; "Leather/soft-tie restraints"; "Automatic emergency defibrillator"; "Mobile police radio"; and "Forcible entry equipment" are considered secondary items for all three classifications. The equipment items "Binoculars", "Photographic equipment (cameras or processing)" and "Call box" are considered secondary items for the CO and YCO, and tertiary items for the YCC. The equipment items "Rubber bullets"; "Bullhorn or hailer"; "Truck"; "Fingerprint equipment"; "Shotgun"; "Bed restraints"; and "X-ray equipment (examining mail and packages)" are considered secondary items for the CO and tertiary items for the other two classifications.

The equipment items "Sting balls" and "Bean bags" are considered secondary items for the YCO and tertiary items for the other two classifications. The equipment items "Remote control locking device panel"; "Controlled substance detection kit"; "Weapons repair/cleaning kit"; "Trauma kit"; "Audio recording equipment"; "Property bag sealers"; "Food preparation equipment (e.g., stove, broilers, ovens)"; "Typewriter"; "Ladder"; "Flashbang"; "Arwen riot control system"; "Cell phone"; "Oxygen supply device/resuscitator"; "Surveillance gear"; "Projection equipment"; "Pager"; "Power supply generator"; "Restraint WRAP"; "Restrain chair"; "Breath analysis equipment"; "Microfilm/microfiche machine"; and "PBX switchboard" are all considered tertiary items for all three classifications.

Table 27. Equipment Criticality Scores for Question A

Equipment Number	Equipment Item	CO Score	YCO Score	YCC Score
42	Keys	3.70	3.74	3.66
35	Handcuffs	3.55	3.68	3.70
14	Body armor, interior (e.g., protective vests)	3.41	2.36	2.06
46	Mace, tear-gas or OC spray	3.31	3.66	3.68
55	Personal alarm system	3.23	3.65	3.40
25	Duty belt	3.18	3.42	3.42
40	Infectious disease/AIDS prevention equipment (e.g., gloves)	3.11	2.74	2.88
39	Impact weapon (e.g., baton, ASP, OPN)	3.10	1.07	0.45
45	Leg irons	3.00	2.87	2.14
69	Speed loader or magazine	2.77	0.19	0.10
82	Whistle	2.76	0.08	0.19
31	Flashlight	2.74	2.58	2.42
75	Telephone	2.72	2.75	3.11
37	Hand-held (two-way) radio or "beeper" radio	2.71	3.15	3.17
3	Alarm system or monitor	2.67	2.62	2.90
78	Traveling chains (hand, wrist, leg, ankle or waist)	2.65	2.12	1.75
66	Rifle	2.45	0.00	0.05
47	Metal detector (for individuals, scanners, or grounds)	2.35	2.64	1.61
13	Body armor, exterior (e.g., riot gear, assault shield)	2.33	1.94	1.37
70	Spit mask	2.29	1.71	1.59
36	Handgun	2.27	0.33	0.12
34	Gas mask or self-contained breathing apparatus	2.20	2.92	2.86
9	Automobile, patrol car	2.07	2.11	0.82

62	Public address system or intercom	1.97	0.56	0.90
56	Photocopier, Xerox machine	1.84	1.29	1.26
38	Housekeeping equipment (e.g., mop, broom, etc.)	1.73	0.94	1.50
71	Stationary radio (e.g., dispatch radio)	1.73	1.97	1.16
01	.37 mm gas gun	1.67	1.48	0.97
29	First aid kit	1.66	2.03	1.77
12	Binoculars	1.52	0.88	0.31
18	Bus or van	1.51	1.90	0.81
28	Fire fighting equipment (e.g., extinguisher, hoses)	1.45	1.19	0.88
57	Photographic equipment (cameras or processing)	1.40	0.87	0.47
26	Emergency lighting equipment (e.g., search lights, flares)	1.38	0.91	0.94
67	Rubber bullets	1.33	0.18	0.19
23	Computer terminal	1.05	2.13	2.27
17	Bullhorn or hailer	0.97	0.06	0.06
6	Audiovisual equipment (video taping)	0.95	0.75	0.64
61	Property storage lockers	0.95	1.01	0.96
2	Adding machine or calculator	0.90	0.58	0.75
79	Truck	0.89	0.31	0.13
27	Fingerprint equipment	0.88	0.20	0.11
44	Leather or soft-tie restraints	0.86	0.61	0.74
68	Shotgun	0.86	0.00	0.03
8	Automatic emergency defibrillator	0.83	1.06	1.09
49	Mobile police radio	0.82	0.77	0.60
11	Bed restraints	0.81	0.18	0.14
33	Forcible entry equipment	0.79	0.97	0.61
83	X-ray equipment (examining mail and packages)	0.70	0.00	0.05
19	Call box	0.57	0.56	0.25
63	Remote control locking device panel	0.53	0.42	0.52
24	Controlled substance detection kit	0.52	0.22	0.36
81	Weapons repair or cleaning kit	0.47	0.31	0.16
77	Trauma kit	0.45	0.33	0.34
5	Audio recording equipment	0.45	0.18	0.18
60	Property bag sealers	0.44	0.17	0.30
72	Sting balls	0.38	0.59	0.51
32	Food preparation equipment (e.g., stove, broilers, ovens)	0.37	0.03	0.04
80	Typewriter	0.35	0.13	0.23
43	Ladder	0.32	0.29	0.36
30	Flashbang	0.29	0.33	0.24
4	Arwen riot control system	0.27	0.13	0.09
22	Cell phone	0.26	0.16	0.05
50	Oxygen supply device/resuscitator	0.24	0.13	0.23
73	Surveillance gear (e.g., infrared scope radio, transmitter)	0.18	0.12	0.08
59	Projection equipment (movie, slide, overhead)	0.17	0.10	0.15
52	Pager	0.15	0.12	0.05
58	Power supply generator	0.12	0.03	0.06
10	Bean bags	0.10	0.59	0.38
65	Restraint WRAP	0.10	0.04	0.10
64	Restrain chair	0.08	0.16	0.23
15	Breath analysis or other equipment for alcohol detection	0.08	0.03	0.02
48	Microfilm/microfiche machine	0.06	0.00	0.03
20	Casework Folder (field book)	0.06	0.20	1.77
54	Pepper ball gun	0.06	1.93	1.30

Note: Primary tasks = 1.73 or above; Secondary tasks = 1.72 – 0.56; Tertiary tasks = 0.55 and below. Shaded areas denote core tasks.

Differences in responses to the question of task frequency were examined based on various demographic elements including gender, ethnicity, and time at current classification. The only differences in response rates that occurred were by SMEs who had been on the job for one year or less, and the difference was not significant. When these respondents were controlled for, no differences emerged. Also examined were response rates based on facility, region, and mission. No significant differences were found aside from distinctions between adult and juvenile facilities as well as between facilities housing male inmates and those housing female inmates.

VII. TASK LINKAGES & KSAO RATINGS

An essential component of the process of building job-related training and selection standards is to ensure the KSAOs they are designed to address are necessary for performing the work tasks and activities carried out on the job. This relationship back to the job is established through a linkage process, wherein SMEs establish links between KSAOs and the tasks to which they are relevant. This process typically involves convening panels of SMEs who study the KSAOs and then review each task to make a judgment of which of the KSAOs are necessary or helpful for carrying out that task. A linkage value is obtained for each task/KSAO combination by averaging the ratings across the SMEs. This process results in a listing, for each task, of the KSAOs needed to perform the task.

Given the large number of "linkages" to carry out, in this case linking 374 task and equipment items with 122 KSAOs, requiring 374 X 122 = 45,628 judgments in total, a common practice is to simplify the process by linking broader groupings of related tasks with broader grouping of related KSAOs (Goldstein, 1993). This reduces the total number of ratings that each SME needs to give, however this efficiency is achieved at the cost of losing vital information about specific links between the tasks and KSAOs. This loss of information was not deemed acceptable for the purposes of this project; therefore an alternative strategy was devised for obtaining linkage ratings of each task/KSAO combination by multiple SMEs. This strategy followed the logic of matrix sampling (Lord & Novick, 1968; Sirotnik, 1970a).

A. Matrix Sampling Plan

Matrix sampling originated in the context of estimating item parameters during the test development process. Normally when a test is evaluated, the entire test is given to a sample of test-takers from the test-taker population, and the properties of the items calculated in this sample are assumed to generalize to the larger population. When the number of items is large so that it is not feasible to administer every item to every test-taker, a matrix sampling plan may be used where the items are split into subsets and each test-taker completes only a subset of the items.

Picturing the full "person by item" matrix with all test-takers in rows and all items in columns, this matrix is basically split up along both dimensions so that item parameters (e.g., item means, variances, item-total correlations) for different subsets of items are estimated from different subsamples of test-takers. If the item subsets are generated through a randomized procedure and sufficiently large subsamples of test-takers are randomly assigned to each item subset, then one can be confident that the item parameters are stable and will be generalizeable to the test-taker population.

Matrix sampling has been supported as a viable strategy in test development (Gressard & Loyd, 1991; Sirotnik, 1970b). Norcini, Shea, and Ping (1988) also demonstrated its usefulness in the context of collecting SME judgments of item difficulty during standard setting. In

their study subsamples of SMEs were asked to rate subsets of items for the purpose of setting a cutoff score using the popular "Angoff" method. We follow suit in using this strategy to collect SME judgments of a large number of task/KSAO linkages.

The matrix sampling plan is depicted in Appendix M. Given practical and operational constraints regarding the number of SMEs and assumptions about the time it would take per item for 122 KSAO linkage judgments, several scenarios where worked out in terms of the number and size of SME samples and task/equipment samples. The final plan that was feasible within the operational constraints was a plan involving 14 sets of 2 SMEs each, with each SME rating approximately 42 tasks. Further, these 42 tasks included 23 common tasks that all 28 SMEs were to rate.

The use of 42 tasks was reasoned based on an assumption that 4 linkage ratings would be made per minute. Linking 42 tasks with 122 KSAOs would involve 5,124 linkage ratings per SME, and a total of 1,270 minutes or approximately 21 hours. Given the agenda for the week involving rater training on the first day and training and discussion at the beginning of each subsequent day, this number of hours was judged reasonable.

The use of two SMEs was less than originally desired, but became necessary in order to balance the various factors as described above. That is, in order to have more SMEs per task, each SME would need to rate significantly more tasks which would not fit within the time constraints. Justification for using two SMEs can be provided on three grounds:

- First, in a recent study of the linkage process Baranowski and Anderson (2005) concluded that "it is not necessary to get ratings from a large number of incumbents or job analysts in order to ensure that linkage ratings are reliable" (page 1053). In fact, they used samples as low as two, but used three most frequently.

- Second, the number two was actually a minimum number of ratings per linkage in the current study, as a live screening procedure was used during the data collection which flagged discrepancies in ratings, and assigned tasks with discrepant ratings to a third SME. Therefore, it would be more accurate to state that each linkage was made by two to three SMEs (except for the common tasks which were rated by all SMEs). This number falls in line with Baranowski and Anderson's (2005) methodology which revealed acceptable reliabilities for SME samples of approximately this same size.

- Third, in order to assess systematic differences between the small SME samples that could potentially bias their linkage ratings we included the common set of 23 tasks which all SMEs were to rate. In fact, over half of each SME's 42 tasks were common tasks. These tasks were sampled from each of the 19 task categories as noted in Appendix L. With these common tasks we could assess whether the entire group of 28 SMEs was rating consistently, which would lend confidence to the assumption that for the remaining tasks they were likewise rating consistently. Detailed analyses of the ratings to test this assumption are provided in the next section.

The identification of the common set of tasks was done at random, as was the separation of the not common tasks into subsets. SMEs were paired with other SMEs that were of the same job classification (CO, YCO, and YCC). This raises a potential concern with systematic between-classification differences, but this concern was mitigated by two factors:

- The task ratings from the JAQ (N > 500) suggested very little systematic differences between these classifications in how they rated the vast majority of the tasks in terms of the frequency and importance.

- Research by Baranowski and Anderson (2005) revealed that different rater types, which they defined as (1) job incumbents versus (2) job analysts who analyzed the jobs and were therefore very familiar with them, versus (3) job analysts who did not analyze the jobs, provided highly consistent linkage ratings. Surely if job incumbents and non-incumbents provide similar linkage ratings, then incumbents from highly similar jobs should be able to provide consistent linkage ratings as well.

It was therefore reasonable to assume that the SMEs from these three classifications would be more or less interchangeable in terms of the linkage ratings they provided, and the more logistically simple strategy of pairing them up within classifications was deemed acceptable. The use of the common task set for ratings made this assumption of cross-classification consistency testable, and the results of this analysis are also provided in the next section.

B. Task and Equipment to KSAO Linkage SME Meeting

During August 2007, 28 SMEs representing juvenile and adult correctional supervisors convened in order to review tasks performed by CO, YCO, and YCC job incumbents and identify the KSAOs required for successful performance of each task (Appendices N and C). The SMEs conducted a similar review and identification process for equipment items used on the job.

Staff provided the SMEs an overview of the CSA, the purpose of the job analysis, and training on the use of the forms and the rating process. SMEs were then given the opportunity to practice under the guidance of CSA staff to increase the likelihood of sufficient rater agreement.

The CSA provided each SME with a pre-assigned group of tasks and equipment items for rating according to the matrix sampling plan detailed above. SMEs recorded their ratings on a task linkage rating form using the following scale. See Appendix O for a sample form.

(0)	***Not Relevant****: This KSAO is not needed to perform the task/activity. Having the KSAO would make no difference in performing this task.*	
(1)	***Helpful****: This KSAO is helpful in performing the task/activity, but is not essential. These tasks could be performed without the KSAO, although it would be more difficult or time-consuming.*	
(2)	***Essential****: This KSAO is essential to performing the task/activity. Without the KSAO, you would not be able to perform these tasks.*	

A true/false statement was included on the form to allow SMEs to indicate their familiarity with each task. The wording of the statement was as follows: "I am able to link this task either because I have performed it or because I have supervised someone performing it." SMEs were instructed to not rate tasks for which they selected false on the certification statement. The intent was that the SMEs would not attempt to rate tasks with which they were unfamiliar.

SMEs worked independently on each rating, and the CSA calculated the rater agreement among the SMEs rating each task. The reliability statistics indicated that rater agreement levels were less than targeted. In a subsequent phase, the CSA paired SMEs and instructed them to continue working independently to link the KSAOs to tasks and equipment items, and then discuss each rating with

their partner in order to reach a consensus rating, if possible. The SME pairs were instructed to pay close attention to any rating for which they had a two point discrepancy, where one SME rated the KSA as not relevant to the task while the other rated it as essential.

Inter-rater reliability was assessed using an intraclass correlation (Appendix P). In summary, analysis of ratings performed by the SMEs revealed the following two primary conclusions:

(1) The job tasks were rated similarly across the three classifications which supports the assumption that the CO, YCO, and YCC classifications operate as a close-knit "job family."

(2) Raters contributed the largest amount of error to the rating process, although the net effect was not large; inter-reliability analysis revealed high intraclass correlations (.93 for the common tasks; .85 for the non-common tasks).

The CSA convened a second SME meeting over a three-day period in September 2007. Twenty SMEs representing juvenile and adult correctional supervisors convened to rate KSAOs and link KSAOs to tasks which had less than 95 percent rater agreement as linked by the previous SME group (Appendices C and M). The SMEs were divided by classification into table groups of three or four.

The CSA provided training to the SMEs and the opportunity to practice rating sample KSAOs under the guidance of CSA staff. The KSAO rating consisted of identifying when each KSAO must be acquired as follows:

> *For each KSAO think about when proficiency in that KSAO is needed. Should applicants be selected into the Academy based on their proficiency in this area or can they learn it at the Academy or after completing the Academy*
> *(0) Possessed at time of hire*
> *(1) Learned during the academy*
> *(2) Learned post academy*

The CSA instructed the SMEs to independently rate each KSAO then discuss results within their pre-assigned table groups to reach a consensus rating, if possible. See Appendix Q for a sample KSAO rating form.

The SMEs were also tasked with linking KSAOs to tasks and equipment items that had not reached 95 percent rater agreement during the linkages meeting that occurred in August 2007. In addition, the SMEs rated four tasks that the previous group was unable to rate. This data was used to determine whether these tasks should be eliminated.

C. Task to KSAO Linkage Results

As mentioned before, each KSAO was evaluated by the SMEs on the extent to which it was necessary for satisfactory performance of each task. A rating of "essential" was assigned a value of 2, a rating of "helpful" was assigned a value of 1, and a rating of "not relevant" was assigned a value of 0. Appendix R shows the mean ratings of each KSAO's relevance to each of the task statements and equipment items.

The information contained in Appendix R is consolidated and presented in Table 28. The six KSAO factors bring together the related KSAOs that were developed using the O*NET classification system as a guide.

- Factor one consists of KSAO categories: Control Movement Abilities; Reaction Time and Speed Abilities; Fine Manipulative Abilities; Physical Abilities; Visual Abilities; and Law and Public Safety. This factor has been named Physical Abilities and Requirements since it is comprised of KSAOs that require physical abilities, and it includes the Law and Public Safety Knowledge category.

- Factor two is composed of KSAO categories Achievement Orientation; Social Influence; Conscientiousness; Adjustment; Attentiveness; Memory Abilities; Spatial Abilities; and Independence. This factor was named Interpersonal Relationships because each of the KSAO categories in this factor deal with social influences and interaction with others such as being conscientious and adjusting to others.

- Factor three is composed of KSAO categories Resource Management Skills; Perceptual Abilities; System Skills; Complex Problem Solving Skills; Social Skills; Math and Science; Health Services; and Education and Training. The name for this factor is Higher Level Cognitive Functioning because the KSAO categories on this factor involve thinking and processing problems for day to day activities in a way that is more abstract and in depth than just standard reading and writing.

- Factor four is labeled Intellectual Skills because of the loadings of the KSAO categories Verbal Abilities, Content Skills, Process Skills, and Practical Intelligence and because all of these categories are needed on a daily basis in order to perform the job duties successfully, and require intelligence in order to use.

- Factor five is composed of KSAO categories Business Management; Quantitative Abilities; Engineering and Technology; Transportation; and Technical Skills. This factor was labeled Procedural and Technical Knowledge based on those KSAO categories.

- Factor six is composed of KSAO categories Auditory and Speech Abilities, Arts & Humanities, Interpersonal Orientation, and Communication. This factor was named Communication because it involves the use of the knowledge of communication styles/methods and the use of the auditory and speech abilities to communicate to others.

Table 28. KSAO Factors Linked to the Task Categories

Task Categories	KSAO Factors											
	Physical Abilities and Requirements		Interpersonal Relationships		Higher Level Cognitive Functioning		Concrete Intellectual Skills		Procedural and Technical Knowledge		Communication	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Booking, Receiving, and Releasing	1.21	0.38	1.69	0.28	1.18	0.38	1.59	0.32	0.83	0.46	1.31	0.35
Casework	0.87	0.54	1.63	0.34	1.33	0.39	1.74	0.27	0.75	0.35	1.31	0.36
Counseling	0.74	0.54	1.63	0.33	1.30	0.37	1.69	0.30	0.40	0.39	1.25	0.41
Court-Related Board Hearings	0.56	0.39	1.42	0.28	0.74	0.51	1.49	0.27	0.37	0.36	1.07	0.33
Arrests	1.71	0.35	1.80	0.21	1.27	0.43	1.66	0.27	0.77	0.45	1.37	0.30
Emergencies	1.65	0.39	1.81	0.20	1.37	0.36	1.61	0.33	0.88	0.43	1.35	0.27
Escort, Move, and Transportation	1.34	0.58	1.60	0.38	1.05	0.49	1.45	0.30	0.70	0.39	1.28	0.42
General Duties	1.04	0.62	1.46	0.47	1.04	0.50	1.48	0.43	0.68	0.50	1.11	0.50
Health and Medical	1.05	0.61	1.69	0.24	1.25	0.37	1.58	0.32	0.53	0.38	1.26	0.40
Investigation	1.24	0.52	1.73	0.25	1.32	0.39	1.71	0.27	0.88	0.42	1.20	0.40
Oral Communication	0.76	0.55	1.57	0.36	1.13	0.48	1.65	0.30	0.58	0.45	1.25	0.39
Read, Review, and Analyze	0.78	0.55	1.57	0.34	1.28	0.44	1.69	0.27	0.77	0.50	0.96	0.44
Referrals	0.84	0.53	1.59	0.37	1.28	0.39	1.65	0.26	0.51	0.36	1.27	0.35
Search	1.53	0.43	1.68	0.32	1.27	0.34	1.58	0.36	0.74	0.40	1.29	0.36
Security	1.31	0.50	1.63	0.34	1.06	0.52	1.42	0.44	0.82	0.46	1.19	0.53
Supervision of Non-Inmates	1.08	0.53	1.77	0.21	1.10	0.47	1.52	0.30	0.69	0.45	1.34	0.33
Supervision of Wards/Inmates	1.27	0.57	1.72	0.31	1.32	0.41	1.59	0.34	0.67	0.47	1.30	0.41
Restraints and Use of Force	1.79	0.23	1.80	0.23	1.33	0.42	1.57	0.29	0.82	0.41	1.28	0.43
Written Communication	0.89	0.51	1.52	0.39	1.12	0.42	1.63	0.27	0.72	0.44	0.96	0.48
Equipment	1.21	0.61	1.30	0.58	0.79	0.52	1.12	0.55	0.70	0.41	0.88	0.53

Each entry in the table represents the mean of the individual tasks and the individual KSAOs comprising the linkage across the three classifications. Ratings closer to 2 reflect a more essential linkage of the KSAO category, ratings in the range of 1 suggest that the KSAOs are helpful in the performance of the tasks, and ratings substantially below 1 imply that the KSAOs are weakly related to the tasks.

The cut-off points established for the means on the consolidated table are as follows: the ranges for "essential" and "helpful" are the same as those for the individual KSAO broad task statement/equipment item linkages. Means ranging from .25 to .74 are considered "less helpful" and means ranging from 0 to .24 are considered "not relevant" to the task category or equipment items. The less helpful rating was created because while these KSAOs may not be essential to

performing the Broad Task Statement or using the equipment item, the KSAO may have an impact that should be examined for selection/training purposes.

The Physical Abilities and Requirements factor is rated as essential for the task categories of Arrests; Emergencies; Escort, Move, and Transportation; Search; Security; Supervision of Wards/Inmates; and Restraints and Use of Force. This factor was rated as helpful to the task categories of Booking, Receiving, and Releasing; Casework; General Duties; Health and Medical; Investigation; Oral Communication; Read, Review, and Analyze; Referrals; Supervision of Non-Inmates; Written Communication; and the equipment category. This factor is rated as less helpful to the task categories of Court-Related Board Hearings and Counseling.

The Interpersonal Relationships factor is rated as essential for all nineteen task categories. It is also rated as essential for the equipment category.

The Higher Level Cognitive Functioning factor is rated as essential for the task categories of Casework; Counseling; Arrests; Emergencies; Health and Medical; Investigation; Read, Review, and Analyze; Referrals; Search; Supervision of Wards/Inmates; and Restraints and Use of Force. This factor is rated as helpful for the task categories of Booking, Receiving, and Releasing; Transportation; General Duties; Oral Communication; Security; Supervision of Non-Inmates; Written Communication; and the equipment category. This factor was rated as less helpful for the task category of Court-Related Board Hearings.

The Concrete Intellectual Skills factor was rated as essential for all nineteen task categories and was rated as helpful for the equipment category.

The Procedural and Technical Knowledge factor was rated as helpful to the task categories of Booking, Receiving, and Releasing; Casework; Arrests; Emergencies; Investigation; Read, Review, and Analyze; Security; and Restraints and Use of Force. This factor was rated as less helpful for the task categories of Counseling; Court-Related Board Hearings; Transportation; General Duties; Health and Medical; Oral Communication; Referrals; Search; Supervision of Non-Inmates; Supervision of Wards/Inmates; Written Communication; and the equipment category.

The Communication factor was rated as essential for the task categories of Booking, Receiving, and Releasing; Casework; Counseling; Arrests; Emergencies; Transportation; Health and Medical; Oral Communication; Referrals; Search; Supervision of Non-Inmates; Supervision of Wards/Inmates; and Restraints and Use of Force. This factor was rated as helpful for the task categories of Court-Related Board Hearings; General Duties; Investigation; Read, Review, and Analyze; Security; Written Communication; and the equipment category.

An initial KSAO categorization based on a visual inspection of the KSAOs was intended as an interim structure. As the data became available, a factor analysis was conducted. The factor analysis examined the 36 KSAO categories in relation to how each KSAO was rated by the SMEs and grouped them together based on those ratings. The results of that analysis are reported here.

When performing an exploratory factor analysis, the aim is to summarize interrelationships between the variables, concisely and accurately to aid in conceptualization. Once the results of this procedure are analyzed, a given number of groups or factors will exist, and the members of each factor will be related categories of the KSAOs. This occurs because the maximum amount of information from the original KSAO categories is contained in as few factors as possible. The goal of this procedure is to reduce a variable set to a smaller set of underlying constructs (Spicer, 2005). This is done by grouping KSAOs that have more in common with each other than with the

remaining KSAOs (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). The goal is to reduce the data into as few factors as possible while retaining an interpretable solution.

Factor analysis is performed in two phases; first is the extraction phase, which is followed by the rotation phase. Each factor accounts for a particular portion of the total variance. The total variance is composed of the different responses that each SME provided. If each SME gave the same response then there would be no variance with these KSAO categories. Since the responses are different, the variance needs to be examined by the factor analysis procedure. In the second phase the factors are mathematically rotated. This involves pivoting the extracted factors around their point of intersection (Meyers, et. al., 2006). The six factor solution was decided upon as being the most interpretable, and was further explored.

The solution was explored using multiple extraction methods and rotation strategies to finalize the most interpretable solution. The Generalized Least Squares method was accepted as the extraction procedure. This technique estimates a variable's communality which represents how much that variable has in common with the remaining variables in the analysis. The Generalized Least Squares method gives greater weight to variables that are more strongly related to other variables in the set (Meyers, et. al., 2006). Generally, the high factor loadings remained consistent regardless of the extraction method used.

Additionally, different rotation strategies were examined. The final solution utilized a Promax Rotation method setting the kappa level at 4. This allowed the factors to be moderately correlated and provided the most interpretable solution. The Promax Rotation increases the large loadings and decreases the small loadings when the factors are correlated (Lawley & Maxwell, 1971). Individual loadings for all factors can be found in Table 29.

Table 29.   KSAO Factor Analysis

	Physical Abilities and Requirements	Interpersonal Relationships	Higher Level Cognitive Functioning	Intellectual Skills	Procedural and Technical Knowledge	Communica-tion
A - Control Movement Abilities	0.93	0.45	0.40	0.20	0.26	0.36
A - Reaction Time and Speed Abilities	0.86	0.53	0.55	0.12	0.24	0.59
A - Fine Manipulative Abilities	0.84	0.44	0.26	0.14	0.13	0.13
A - Physical Abilities	0.77	0.45	0.52		0.29	0.58
A - Visual Abilities	0.72	0.45	0.50	0.13	0.14	0.58
K - Law and Public Safety	0.49	0.48	0.39	0.43	0.38	0.48
S - Technical Skills	0.46	0.17	0.45		0.46	0.33
O - Achievement Orientation	0.50	0.87	0.56	0.44	0.33	0.51
O - Social Influence	0.55	0.84	0.59	0.47	0.38	0.57
O - Conscientiousness	0.34	0.81	0.36	0.48	0.19	0.40
O - Adjustment	0.37	0.79	0.57	0.50	0.41	0.67
A - Attentiveness	0.53	0.72	0.57	0.40	0.27	0.51
A - Memory Abilities	0.42	0.58	0.39	0.54	0.23	0.31
A - Spatial Abilities	0.47	0.55	0.39	0.39		0.38
O - Independence	0.22	0.46	0.16	0.45	0.24	0.20
S - Resource Management Skills	0.43	0.56	0.86	0.42	0.47	0.50
A - Perceptual Abilities	0.46	0.59	0.81	0.52	0.37	0.56
S - System Skills	0.32	0.38	0.80	0.38	0.45	0.49
S - Complex Problem Solving Skills	0.29	0.49	0.77	0.75	0.42	0.47
S - Social Skills	0.31	0.53	0.73	0.57	0.37	0.60
K - Math and Science	0.38	0.47	0.64	0.37	0.56	0.61
K - Health Services	0.18	0.32	0.50	0.30	0.37	0.46
K - Education and Training	0.23	0.34	0.44	0.19	0.41	0.41
S - Content Skills		0.50	0.42	0.84	0.29	0.37
A - Verbal Abilities	0.18	0.55	0.49	0.76	0.31	0.47
S - Process Skills	0.33	0.42	0.71	0.73	0.36	0.37
O - Practical Intelligence	0.30	0.52	0.51	0.57	0.50	0.48
K - Business Management		0.28	0.37	0.40	0.83	0.29
A - Quantitative Abilities	0.41	0.44	0.63	0.43	0.63	0.53
K - Engineering and Technology	0.30	0.27	0.41	0.11	0.60	0.35
K - Transportation	0.34	0.26	0.49	0.21	0.57	0.44
A - Auditory and Speech Abilities	0.55	0.58	0.49	0.29	0.24	0.77
K - Arts & Humanities	0.20	0.42	0.62	0.48	0.63	0.67
O - Interpersonal Orientation	0.21	0.54	0.50	0.50	0.45	0.61
K - Communication	0.27	0.31	0.37	0.30	0.46	0.56

The KSAO categories that are contained within each of the six factors and their loadings are described below:

- Factor one consists of KSAO categories: Control Movement Abilities; Reaction Time and Speed Abilities; Fine Manipulative Abilities; Physical Abilities; Visual Abilities; and Law and Public Safety. Control Movement Abilities had the highest factor loading at .93. Law and Public Safety had the lowest loading at .49, but this category had similar loadings on other factors. This factor has been named Physical Abilities and Requirements since it is

comprised of KSAOs that require physical abilities, but is complicated by the inclusion of the Law and Public Safety Knowledge. CDCR has strict regulations about use of force and when it can be used, and because of this, the Law and Public Safety category was included with factor one instead of the other factors that showed similar loadings. This factor requires the use of physical abilities, but the incumbents need to know when it is acceptable to use force. The KSAO category of Technical Skills had a loading of .46 on this factor, as well as on factor five; therefore the decision was made to include Technical Skills on factor five because it fit better with the rest of the factor five categories.

- Factor two is composed of KSAO categories Achievement Orientation; Social Influence; Conscientiousness; Adjustment; Attentiveness; Memory Abilities; Spatial Abilities; and Independence. The last two categories had similar loadings on other factors, but after examining each factor it was decided that these two categories fit best with factor two than any of the other factors. Achievement Orientation had the highest loading at .87. Factor two is Interpersonal Relationships, and is strongly influenced by the loadings of Achievement Orientation and Social Influence. Each of the KSAO categories in this factor involves social influences and interaction with others, such as conscientiousness and adjusting to others.

- Factor three is composed of KSAO categories Resource Management Skills; Perceptual Abilities; System Skills; Complex Problem Solving Skills; Social Skills; Math and Science; Health Services; and Education and Training. Education and Training had similar loading on other factors, but it was decided that this category fit better with this factor than the other two that it loaded on. The Resource Management Skills category had the highest loading on this factor at .86, followed by Perceptual Abilities which loaded at .81. The name for this factor is Higher Level Cognitive Functioning because of the loadings of the KSAO categories on this factor. They all involve thinking and processing problems for day to day activities in a way that is more abstract and in depth than just standard reading and writing. This involves higher level cognitive functions and therefore, this factor is named Higher Level Cognitive Functioning.

- Factor four is called Intellectual Skills because of the loadings of the KSAO categories Verbal Abilities, Content Skills, Process Skills, and Practical Intelligence. Content Skills had the highest loading of .84 and Practical Intelligence had the lowest of .57. This was labeled Intellectual Skills because all of these categories are needed on a daily basis in order to perform the job duties successfully, and require intelligence in order to use. These categories are not as cognitively demanding as those in factor three, but are necessary for successful job performance. These kinds of categories include reading, writing, and speaking, as well as having the necessary practical intelligence in order to know when to use them.

- Factor five is composed of KSAO categories Business Management; Quantitative Abilities; Engineering and Technology; Transportation; and Technical Skills. This factor was labeled Procedural and Technical knowledge based on the loadings of those KSAO categories. Technical Skills had a loading of .46 for this factor, which was the same as the loading on factor one. The decision was made to include it on this factor because it fit better with the other categories on factor five than it did with the categories on factor one. Each KSAO category on this factor deals with the procedural or technical knowledge required to perform tasks. Business Management deals with the principles of administration and procedures needed when filling out paperwork or other clerical related duties. The rest of the categories

on this factor deal with how to perform things such as math problems; what is necessary when dealing with equipment and new technology; how to transport people and things; as well as the skills necessary when operating machinery. These are necessary to perform the tasks and one needs to be familiar with regulations in order to perform the tasks necessary to use that equipment item so that they are used safely as well as used in a manner consistent with regulations.

- Factor six is composed of KSAO categories Auditory and Speech Abilities, Arts & Humanities, Interpersonal Orientation, and Communication and is called Communication because of the loadings of in this factor. Auditory and Speech Abilities had the highest loading of .77 and Communication had the lowest loading of .56. When looking at these categories as a whole they all deal with using communication in order to speak to other people. It involves the use of the knowledge of communication styles/methods and the use of the auditory and speech abilities to communicate to others. This factor does not deal with communication content, but rather the process of communication itself.

Appendix S provides the mean ratings for each of the 122 KSAOs in terms of when proficiency is needed or should be acquired. As mentioned, SMEs assigned ratings based on the following designations: (0) "Possessed at time of hire," (1) "Learned during the academy," and (2) "Learned post academy."

- In the Internal Skills category, KSAOs related to understanding and communicating in written English; listening and conveying information to others; and process skills such as evaluating different approaches to learn or solve problems were assessed by SMEs as being required prior to academy attendance. KSAOs related to identifying problems and finding, organizing, and classifying information fell into the area of being learned during the academy, while KSAOs related to other complex problem solving skills such as developing implementation approaches and evaluating the likely success of ideas fell into the learned post-academy area.

- SMEs rated most KSAOs in the External Skills category (includes social, technical, system, and resource management skills), as able to be learned post-academy, with the exception of managing one's own time and the time of others, which SMEs felt was needed prior to entrance into the academy.

- Most of the KSAOs in the Cognitive Abilities category were rated as being required prior to entrance into the academy. These KSAOs included verbal, quantitative, memory, perceptual, and spatial abilities as well as attentiveness. Some abilities related to idea generation and reasoning were rated as needed during the academy or post-academy.

- All KSAOs related to psychomotor, physical, visual, auditory, and speech abilities were rated as required prior to entrance into the academy. In addition to the ability to see, hear, and exert oneself physically, these abilities include fine manipulative, control movement, reaction time, and speed abilities.

- Many of the KSAOs related to the Personal Characteristics category were rated as being required prior to entrance into the academy, including interpersonal skills and conscientiousness, while some aspects of achievement orientation, social influence, adjustment, independence, and practical intelligence were thought to be acquired during the academy or post-academy.

- The majority of KSAOs related to technical knowledge, with the exception of knowledge of the structure and content of the English language, were rated as acquired during the academy or post-academy. These include knowledge of business, technology, math, health services, education, and the arts.

- In the final category, Procedural Knowledge, KSAOs related to public safety and communication were rated as learned during the academy, while those related to transportation were thought to be acquired post-academy.

VIII. DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION

The job analysis began with the hypothesis that there is overlap between the CO, YCO, and YCC job classifications. The results of the job analysis support this hypothesis in that 48 percent or 138 tasks out of the 285 that were evaluated have been found to be core tasks for all three classifications (Table 30). Additionally, there are 14 of the 75 equipment items that have been found to be primary equipment items for all three classifications.

Table 30. Core Task/Equipment Item Overlap

Classification		Number of Core Tasks/Items	Percentage of Additional Overlap	Percentage of Total Overlap
CO, YCO, and YCC	Tasks	138 of 285	--	48.42%
	Equipment	14 of 75	--	18.67%
YCO and YCC	Tasks	7 of 285	2.45%	50.87%
	Equipment	2 of 75	2.67%	21.34%
CO and YCO	Tasks	18 of 285	6.30%	54.72%
	Equipment	3 of 75	4.00%	22.67%
CO and YCC	Tasks	17 of 285	5.96%	54.38%
	Equipment	0	0	18.67%

There were seven additional common core tasks identified between the YCO and YCC classifications, for a total of more than 50 percent overlap between the two, and two additional shared equipment items. Eighteen additional core tasks and three equipment items are shared between the CO and YCO classifications (close to 55 percent overlap). Finally, 17 additional common core tasks were identified between the CO and YCC classifications (again, close to 55 percent overlap) and no equipment items. For a comparison of the core tasks and equipment items common and unique to each of the three classifications, refer to Appendix T.

While there was a degree of overlap between the three classifications, there are areas unique to each. There are 15 core tasks that are unique to the CO classification. These include core tasks involving the discharge of firearms, dealing with contaminated or hazardous materials, and transportation of inmates. Equipment items unique to the CO (eight in addition to common core equipment items) include impact weapons, ammunition, rifle, handgun, and whistle.

There were no unique tasks for the YCO classification, although there were three unique equipment items (stationary radio, bus or van, pepper ball gun). The YCC classification had 15 unique core tasks and one unique equipment item (casework folder). Unique core tasks involved casework, counseling, health and medical, supervision of wards, and written communication.

A. Implications

The overlap in core tasks and equipment items between the classifications of CO, YCO, and YCC allow for the use of a "job components" or "job families" approach to developing employee selection and training standards for these classifications. This means that some selection tests and training criteria could be the same across the three jobs. Others could be modified to take into account job differences.

The ability to share selection and training standards between the CO, YCO and YCC provides CDCR with greater speed and flexibility in selecting and training a competent workforce. For example, transfers between classifications can be quickly accommodated by requiring the completion of only those selection and training criteria that are unique to the classification assuming that the shared component requirements have already been met. This can apply to individual transfers as well as to accommodate facility closures and enables CDCR to quickly place human resources where they are most needed.

This benefit expands to the addition of the remaining 44 entry-level, first-line, and second-line supervisory correctional peace officer classifications for which the CSA will develop selection and training standards. With the job components analysis method applied to the job analyses and subsequent selection and training standards development for these classifications, CDCR's workforce flexibility is further increased. CDCR can capitalize on the identified overlaps between all classifications which ultimately translate into greater efficiencies. With this approach, time and effort is maximized.

In addition, when new correctional peace officer classifications are developed and added, a job analysis can quickly determine the selection and training procedures that will be appropriate. Existing employee selection and training procedures can be transported to the new job, eliminating the need for additional, expensive test and training development and validation. The same principle applies to new tasks added to existing jobs or changes in policies and procedures in that it can quickly be determined how selection and training procedures need to be amended.

References

American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education (1999), *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.* Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Baranowski, L.E., & Anderson, L. E. (2005). Examining rating source variation in work behavior to KSA linkages. *Personnel Psychology, 58,* 1041–1054.

Goldstein, I. L. (1993). *Training in organizations* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Gressard, R. P., & Loyd, B. H. (1991). A comparison of item sampling plans in the application of multiple matrix sampling. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 28,* 199–130.

Lawley, D. N., Maxwell, A. E., (1971). *Factor analysis as a statistical method* (2nd ed.). New York: American Elsevier Publishing.

Lord, F. M., & Novick, M. R. (1968). *Statistical theories of mental test scores.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., Guarino, A. J., (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Norcini, J. J., Shea, J. A., & Ping, J. C. (1988). A note on the application of multiple matrix sampling to standard setting. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 25,* 159–164.

Peterson, N. G., Mumford, M. D., Borman, W. C., Jeanneret, P. R., Fleishman, E. A. (1999). *An occupational information system for the 21st century: The development of the O*NET.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc. (2003). *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures.* (4th Ed.) Bowling Green, OH: Author.

Spicer, J., (2005). *Making sense of multivariate data analysis.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedure (1978); 43 FR 38295 (August 25, 1978).

Appendices